













THE  
CLASSICAL JOURNAL

FOR

MARCH AND JUNE, 1828.

VOL. XXXVII.

ὦ φίλος, εἰ σοφὸς εἶ, λάβε μ' ἐς χέρας· εἰ δέ γε πάμπαν  
Νῆϊς ἔφους Μουσέων, ῥίψον ἅ μὴ νοέεις.

EPIGR. INCERT.



London:

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY,  
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

SOLD BY

LON MAN, REES, ORME, BROWN, AND GREEN; C. AND  
J. RIVINGTON; PARKER, OXFORD; BARRET, CAM-  
BRIDGE; MACREDIE AND CO., EDINBURGH;  
CUMMING, DUBLIN; AND ALL  
OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1828.

*The Numbers are regularly published on the first of April, July, October, and January. Subscribers may, therefore, have them with their Reviews and Magazines, by giving a general order to their Booksellers.*

*The former Numbers may now be had of all the Booksellers Price 6s. each ; or in complete sets.*

*Articles are requested to be sent one month at least before the day of publication, directed to the Printer, Red Lion Court.*

# CONTENTS OF NO. LXXIV.

	Page
De Ventis. H. TAYLOR.....	175
An Inquiry into the Credit due to Dionysius of Halicarnassus as a Critic and Historian. By the author of 'Remarks on the supposed Dionysius Longinus'.....	179
A Hint towards the correction of a Passage in Æschylus	185
Fragments of a Senatus Consultum in honor of Germanicus .....	202
Antique Representations of Helen .....	204
Bayer and Bohusz.....	221
Some Incidents in the Life of Cyrillus Lucaris, patriarch of Constantinople .....	225
Extracts from Neglected Books .....	229
Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis, in answer to his Defence of the Three Heavenly Witnesses, 1 John v. 7. By R. PORSON .....	232
Biblical Criticism. T. GRIMES .....	251
Extracts from Persian Manuscripts .....	254
Notice of Bibliotheca Classica. By J. LEMPRIERE, D.D. Re-edited by E. H. BARKER, Esq. from the Sixth American Edition by C. Anthon, Esq. With an Appendix by MR. BARKER .....	257
Notice of Gymnasium, sive Symbola Critica. By the Rev. ALEX. CROMBIE, LL. D.—Also Clavis Gymnasij &c.	264
Notice of Classical Manual; or, a Mythological, Historical, and Geographical Commentary on Pope's Homer, and Dryden's Æneid of Virgil .....	265

	Page
ADVERSARIA LITERARIA, No. XLV.—Miscellaneous	
—Inscription in the church at Margam—Verses by Dr. Ramsden—Latin Verses by Prof. Porson—Inscrip- tion on a monument in Sprowston church, Norfolk . . .	265
Oxford Latin Prize Poem, for 1801 :— <i>Carmin Seculare.</i>	
—HEBER.....	281
Riddles of PROFESSOR PORSON .....	286
On the Prevalence of the Arabic Language in Asia and Africa, and on the various Languages in use amongst the inhabitants of great cities in the territory of Musel- men .....	287
Oxford Latin Prize Essay, for 1828. G. A. DENISON	291
Oxford Latin Prize Poem, for 1828 :— <i>Machinæ vi vaporis impulsæ.</i> T. LEIGH CLAUGHTON .....	304
Oxford English Prize Poem for 1828 :— <i>Richard Cœur de Lion.</i> J. ANSTICE .....	309
Literary Intelligence .....	319
Correspondence .....	325

## FOR THE PURPOSES OF EDUCATION.

De Differentia Prosæ et Poeticæ Orationis Disputatio.	
A GOTTFR. HERMANNO. No. II.....	185
Athenian Elegance delineated; or, a Critical Inquiry into the Principles and Laws of the Grecian Tragic Poetry	208
Nugæ, No. XXI.—Notes on Virgil, &c.....	245
Canons and Remarks on the Tragedies of Æschylus as edited by DR. BLOMFIELD .....	275

## CONTENTS OF NO. LXXIII.

	Page
Notice of 'Sketches of Persia, from the Journals of a Traveller in the East' .....	1
Classical Criticism .....	8
R. BLUNTLEIGH Emendationes ad L. Annæi Senecæ Opera	11
Addenda: Class. Journ. No. xxxix. <i>On Literary Coincidences</i> —No. lxxii. <i>Curæ Posteriores ad Dawes. Misc. Crit.</i> .....	31
Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis, in answer to his Defence of the Three Heavenly Witnesses, 1 John v. 7. By R. PORSON .....	33
Sale of the Rev. H. Drury's Library .....	68
Translation of a Review of 'Rose's <i>Inscriptiones Græcæ vetustissimæ</i> ;' by C. O. MULLER .....	75
De Differentia Prosæ et Poeticæ Orationis Disputatio. A G. HERMANNO .....	79
Notice of 1. Introduction to the Writing of Greek. By PROF. SANDFORD.—2. Rules and Exercises in Homeric and Attic Greek; to which is added, a short System of Greek Prosody. By the Same .....	90
The Theology of the Primitive Greeks .....	102
A Critical Dissertation on Romans viii. 28—31 .....	108
Notice of 'Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum; edidit AUG. BOECKHIUS' .....	140

	Page
Notice of 'An Etymological Dictionary of the Latin Language. By the REV. F. E. J. VALPY, M. A.' .....	146
ADVERSARIA LITERARIA, No. XLIV. — A Latin Charade—Attempts at Punning in Greek .....	152
Oxford Latin Prize Poem, for 1778: On Canals. — AL- COCK .....	153
Literary Intelligence .....	160
Correspondence .....	173

## FOR THE PURPOSES OF EDUCATION.

Athenian Elegance delineated; or, a Critical Inquiry into the Principles and Laws of the Grecian Tragic Poetry	21
On several Passages of Strabo, Plutarch, and Athenæus, concerning the Works of Aristotle. By PROF. BRANDIS .....	56
Nugæ, No. XX.—Supplement to Notes on Ausonius and Claudian .....	63
Origination of the Greek Cases, &c. By J. TATE ....	97
PROF. SANDFORD'S Translation of 'the Homeric Digamma,' by Dr. THIERSCH. Part II. ....	118
Canons and Remarks in the Hippolytus and Alcestis of PROF. MONK .....	124
On the Study of the Hebrew Roots .....	134
Cambridge Classical Examination Papers, for 1828 ....	157

THE  
CLASSICAL JOURNAL;

N<sup>o</sup>. LXXIII.

MARCH, 1828..

---

NOTICE OF

*Sketches of Persia, from the Journals of a Traveller in the East.* 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1827. Murray.

TO those who read merely for amusement, these entertaining volumes will afford ample gratification; while those whose object is solid information, may be assured that in the "*Sketches of Persia*" they will find most authentic and accurate delineations of character, manners, and customs. This we can venture to affirm, on the authority of a gentleman who has traced the "*Sketcher's*" route through several of his Persian journeys, and was well acquainted with many of the personages commemorated in these pages. It is not our business to inquire why the author of so creditable a publication should have suppressed his name; but from various circumstances of internal evidence, we must acknowledge ourselves inclined to adopt the general opinion which ascribes it to Sir John Malcolm: who has already distinguished himself by literary productions of considerable merit; and who, during two missions from our East-Indian government, (first as Captain, afterwards as General Malcolm,) succeeded in rendering himself a universal favorite among the Persians, without the slightest sacrifice either of the dignity or of the advantages of that honorable body which he represented.

But whoever may be the author, he modestly professes to offer little more than "sketches taken on the spot, while the facts and the feelings to which they relate were," says he, "fresh and warm before me; and I can truly affirm, that the sense, the nonsense, the anecdotes, the fables, and the tales—all, in short, which these volumes contain, with the exception of a few sage reflections of my own, do actually belong to the good people amongst whom they profess to have been collected." (Introd. p. xi.)

VOL. XXXVII. Cl. JI. NO. LXXIII. A



In another place he says—"Nothing that had hitherto appeared respecting Persia at all frightened me. I am no historian, therefore I did not tremble at Sir John Malcolm's ponderous quartos: I am no tourist, Mr. Morier's Journeys gave me no uneasiness: the learned Researches of Sir William Ouseley were enough to terrify an antiquarian, but that was not my trade; and as I happen to have clumsy, untaught fingers, and little if any taste for the picturesque, I viewed without alarm the splendid volumes of Sir Robert Kerr Porter. Far different, however, was the case when that rogue Hajji Baba made his appearance. I perused him with anxiety; but was 'consoled by finding, that though he approached the very borders of my province, he had made no serious inroads.'" (Intro. p. ix.)

Whatever expectations the reader may be induced to form by these hints, we must content ourselves with a brief statement of the author's route. From Bombay he proceeded to Muscat on the Arabian coast, and incidentally mentions an anecdote related by the captain of the vessel in which he performed this voyage: going one day to visit a tender containing several men who had just been pressed, and were strictly confined in their floating prison, he found them, nevertheless, "joining in the chorus of one of our patriotic airs, and singing with great glee the old song, 'Who are so free as we sons of the waves?'"—(Vol. i. p. 9.)

Muscat furnished our traveller with many interesting observations on the Arabs of that place, and their chief or Imam: one of them having looked through an English telescope at some distant fortifications, suddenly went off exclaiming, "You are magicians; and I now see how you take towns: that thing (pointing to the telescope), be they ever so far off, brings them as near as you like." (P. 25.) From Muscat our author, sailing up the Persian Gulf, soon found himself, as he informs us (p. 27,) "on classic ground, where all the wonderful adventures of Sinbad the sailor were, what a genuine Yankee would call, located." Here he heard of the Wahabees, or Jouassimes, a piratical race of Arabs, who, adhering to the sacred text of the Koran, which forbids them to plunder the living, kill their prisoners before they strip them. At Bushire, or more correctly Abusheher, on the Persian coast, the British *elchee*, or envoy, with his inseparable companion the ingenious Sketcher, landed, to the great amusement of men, women, and children, who seemed astonished at the uniform appearance and regular movements of some English soldiers, belonging to the 84th regiment. Here the envoy, desirous of conferring an essential benefit on the Persians, undertook to introduce amongst them the cultivation of potatoes. "It is satisfactory to add, that the plan for introducing this valuable root did not fail: they were found to flourish at Abusheher, where they are called 'Malcolm's plums' (*alou e Malcolm*), after the *elchee*, who looks to the accident which gave his name

to a useful vegetable, as one of his best chances of enduring fame." (P. 36.)

The reader will find in chap. iv. some very shrewd and just observations on the Turks, given in the form of a conversation (whether real or imaginary) with Abdulla Aga; whose remarks also on the Persian character seem founded on an intimate knowledge of it; but these our limits will not allow us even to abridge. One trait, however, of the Arab character we must notice.—The surgeon had just set a man's broken leg, and observed to the patient that he complained more of the accident than became one of his tribe; "Do not think, Doctor," said the Arab, "that I should have uttered one word of complaint, if my own high-bred colt in a playful kick had broken both my legs; but to have a bone broken by a brute of a jack-ass is too bad, and I will complain." Thus an artilleryman in India, having been upbraided for too loudly lamenting that his arm had been shattered in a battle, replied, "It is not the wound, Sir, of which I complain: had I lost a limb by a cannon-ball, I should not have said a word; but to lose one by a rascally rocket, would make any one mad." (P. 51.)

It seems to us very doubtful whether the ignorant, half-naked, swarthy men and women, broiling (as our author describes them) under the burning sun of Abusheher, with hardly any food but dates, are such objects of pity as might be imagined:—they looked contented; and all the details of English wealth and luxury—the fine gardens, fine clothes, fine houses, and fine carriages—failed to excite any sentiment but pity, when they learned that England did not produce a single date-tree; "and they went away wondering how men could live in a country where there were no date-trees." (P. 77.) From Abusheher the envoy and his party proceeded through Kazeroon to Shiraz; near which city they were feasted by the prince and chief inhabitants, with such a profusion of ice-creams, sweetmeats, preserves, and delicious fruits, that the meanest followers of the camp, even the dog-keepers, were busied in devouring these luxuries.—"A lion's share was always allotted to a party of the 17th dragoons, which forms part of the escort. I heard these fine fellows, who were all (says our author), with the exception of one man, from Ireland, discussing, as they were eating their ices, their preserves, their grapes and nectarines, the merits of Persia: 'It is a jewel of a country,' says one: 'It would be,' said a second, 'if there were more Christians in it.'—'I don't so much mind the Christians,' observed his companion, 'if I could see a bog now and then, instead of these eternal rocks and valleys as they call them.'—'Fine though it be,' concluded Corporal Corragan, 'I would not give a potato-garden in little Ireland for a dozen of it, and all that it contains to boot.' This patriotic sentiment, which appeared to meet with general concurrence, closed the dis-

cussion." (P. 99.) From the ninth chapter we learn the vast importance attached by Persian courtiers to ceremonies and etiquette, and the difficulties which were purposely thrown in the way of our envoy on his introduction to the prince at Shiraz: having here successfully insisted on the seat of honor and other privileges due to his situation, the envoy had not any occasion subsequently to contend on points of ceremony.

\* Some excellent remarks on Eastern apologues, tales, fables, and romances, may be found in chapters ix and x, with curious specimens of the flowery and hyperbolical style used in the preambles of treaties and other compositions. "Speaking on the above subjects to Aga M'her," (says our author, p. 158,) "I asked him if their monarchs were as much delighted with this hyperbolical style as the meerzas or secretaries: "Not at all," said he; "the late king, Aga Mahomed, who was remarkable for his hatred of ornament and show in every form, when his secretaries began with their flattering introductions, used to lose all temper, and exclaim, (*Bem-zmoon, badbakht*;) 'Till the contents, you scoundrel.'" But some of the best Persian historians adopted a plain and distinct style; of which a fair specimen is given (p. 163.) in the anecdote respecting Yezdshird: this monarch was last of the Kajarian, or rather, as an Orientalist suggests to us, of the Sassanian race. Our ingenious author, studiously avoiding any display of erudition, either in numerous quotations or elaborate notes, has not mentioned the Persian writer from whose work this anecdote is extracted. But the reader may be assured of its authenticity: for we learn from our friend, the Orientalist above noticed, that it is translated from the *Chronicle of Ahmed Ibn Assem of Cufa*. This, indeed, appears from the Persian text of the anecdote, which was printed many years ago in the "Oriental Collections," (Vol. i. p. 162.) with an English translation, by the Rev. B. Cierrans, differing so slightly from our present author's version, that we must regard both as having been faithfully executed; and whether the printed text or some manuscript was consulted on this occasion by our accomplished Sketcher, is a matter of little concern to the general reader, since the story is affecting, well told, and, there is every reason to believe, historically true. Of a different kind, but highly entertaining, is the story of *Abdulla and Zeeba*: related by Derveesh Seffer, with a design of convincing the envoy that "worldly success might be promoted by munificence, in any shape, to shrines like those of which he (the Derveesh) had charge." (P. 177.) Of this man's extraordinary powers in recitation, an anecdote is given, p. 199. When he began his story, two gentlemen prepared to leave the party, as they did not understand Persian. "Entreat them to stay (said the Derveesh), and they will soon find that their ignorance of the language does not place them beyond my power." His wishes were explained, and the result proved

he was correct; they were nearly as much entertained as others, and had their feelings almost equally excited; such was his admirable expression of countenance, and so varied the intonations of his voice.

On the march from Shiraz to Isfahan, the magnificent remains of Jemsheed's palace at Persepolis, and the ruins at a place called Mader e Suliman, enable our author to condense, with his wonted ingenuity, into twenty or thirty lines, the sum of many learned but very dry investigations, which occupy a much greater number of quarto pages in the works of different travellers and laborious antiquaries. Nevertheless, as he disclaims any inclination towards the subject of antiquities, we shall not offer any remarks on those interesting monuments, but proceed to notice one of the original and excellent anecdotes which abound in this work. It was related 'to the envoy by Hajee Ibrahim at Isfahan:—A shopkeeper, he said, went to his brother to represent that he would not pay an impost: "You must pay it like others," said the governor (Hajee Ibrahim's brother), "or leave the city."—"Where can I go?" asked the man: "To Shiraz or Cashan."—"Your nephew rules the one city, and your brother the other."—"Go to the king, and complain, if you like."—"Your brother the Hajee is prime minister."—"Then go to hell," said the enraged governor. "Hajee Merhoom, the pious pilgrim, your father, is dead," retorted the undaunted Isfahaneer. "My friend," said the governor, bursting into a laugh, "I will pay the impost myself, since you declare my family keeps you from all redress, both in this world and the next." (P. 235.) From Isfahan the envoy proceeded through Cashan and Koorn to Teheran: and the chapters describing this journey are replete with entertaining anecdotes and instructive observations; sometimes conveyed under the form of dialogues with Aga Meer, Jaffier Ali, or other Asiatic friends: but our limits will scarcely allow us to notice as particularly curious the remarks on Mahomedan ladies, their rights and privileges after marriage, and divorces; with the story of Sadik Beg, who, having married a high-born shrew, terrified her into good behaviour by cutting off the head of her favorite beautiful cat on the very day of their nuptials. One of his friends, a little man named Merdek, who had the misfortune to be governed by a wife of very violent temper, hearing how this exploit of Sadik had succeeded, significantly exclaimed, "A word to the wise;" and immediately on his return home was welcomed as usual by the unsuspecting cat, his wife's great favorite; but in a moment he severed the poor animal's head from its body: the result was such a blow from his enraged wife, as laid him sprawling on the floor; and knowing whose example he intended to imitate, "Take that," said she, giving him another cuff, "take that, you paltry wretch: you should," she added, laughing him to scorn, "have killed the cat on the wedding-day." (Vol. ii. p. 57.)

For the reception of our envoy by his Persian Majesty at Teheran, and the details of ceremonies, we must refer to the "Sketches" themselves; merely noticing the expectations and hopes entertained by a person of the court that the envoy, a British military officer, should, on his presentation to the king, be dressed in the full costume of Queen Elizabeth's time, according to some old portraits of European ambassadors who had visited Persia above two centuries ago. (Vol. ii. p. 121.) One of those little anecdotes by which the Eastern character is so well delineated, occurs in p. 171. The author having become acquainted at Teheran with a man of rank called Ali Mahomed Khan, met him some time after at Calcutta, and having pointed out the beauties of that splendid capital, the fine streets thronged with carriages, the crowded shipping in its noble river, the college, palaces, and magnificent buildings, asked the Khan his opinion of it: "A wonderful place to plunder," was the reply; and his eyes glistened, as if he made it with anticipated enjoyment. On this subject an Armenian remarked, that "Nature will come out;" and he quoted a proverb, "They were preaching the gospel over the head of a wolf:" "Stop," said he, "I see a flock of sheep passing."

Among the personages of high rank whose characters are well described in this work, we must notice Meerza Boozorg, who presided over the councils of Abbas Meerza, the heir-apparent to the throne. This minister acknowledged that he had escaped the fate which generally attended men of his class, by avoiding any accumulation of money or property, living on a small landed inheritance, and spending every thing else: "this principle," said he, "is known; and the king often laughs, and says, 'I should not gain one piastre by the death and plunder of that extravagant fellow, Meerza Boozorg.'" (P. 188.)

Our author's visit to the royal camp of Sooltaneah, his anecdotes of the king, prince-royal, and other distinguished personages—the envoy's investiture with the order of the Lion and Sun—the extraordinary vicissitudes in the life of Hoosein Khan of Mero—the march to Tebreez, and account of the lake of Oormeah—the halt at Maraga—the journey into Kurdistan, and the arrival at Sennah, the capital of a province called Ardelan,—furnish ample subject for many entertaining pages: but the story of Ahmed the cobbler must be particularly noticed, as one that would have deserved a place among the Arabian Tales of a "Thousand and One Nights;" or among the Persian Tales of "a Thousand and One Days," which Petis de la Croix translated into French.

Here we were about to close our notice of this highly amusing work, and to express our regret that it leaves the ingenious author at Sennah in Ardelan, while Hamadan the ancient Ecbatana, Kermanshah once the residence of the mighty Chosroes, Bagdad, Bassorah, and many other interesting places, remain before him still unexplored: but our friend and coadjutor, the Orientalist above

mentioned, equally pleased with the perusal of these volumes as ourselves, and equally desirous of again meeting the accomplished author in a continuation of the "Sketches," or in some similar work, has requested of us to suggest the advantage which those engaged in studying Eastern literature and antiquities would derive from the insertion of a few references in certain parts which he has marked in his own copy. Orientalists and antiquaries, we have reason to suspect, are particularly inquisitive respecting the authorities from which a writer borrows his information: we, on the contrary, were rather inclined to congratulate ourselves on the rare occurrence of notes and quotations in a work that had afforded us so much gratification; and it still seems to us a matter perfectly unimportant, whether the Sketcher at all times consulted original Persian manuscripts, or availed himself of texts already printed and translated: neither did we think of inquiring whether in his remarks, which always amused or instructed us, might be found a coincidence with remarks on the same subjects made by preceding writers. Yet, on our friend's suggestion, we shall inform such readers as may happen to be orientalists, that they will find the Persian texts of *Amir Dazee*, and other writers concerning the scorpions of *Cashan*, and the damsels of that place, beautiful as the nymphs of *Paradise*, &c., (see *Sketches*, vol. ii. p. 2.) given in *Sir Wm. Ouseley's Travels*, (vol. iii. p. 87, 88.) And on the same authority we may observe, that although many of our old travellers, in general terms styled *Rustam* (or *Roostem*) the Persian *Hercules*; yet the first who took the trouble of collecting into one point of view, and examining the minute details in which the Persian hero resembled the Grecian, was *Sir Wm. Ouseley*; who, however, has devoted to this subject four-and-twenty quarto pages, interlarded (if we may use the expression) with quotations from Greek and Latin, Armenian, Persian, French, and Italian writers; while our Sketcher (vol. i. p. 218.) exhibits, in the compass of one page, (without any ostentatious display of authorities,) the principal features of resemblance between *Roostem* and *Hercules*; the serpents crushed; the elephant brained; *Ephialtes* shot in one eye; both eyes of *Esfondiar* blinded; the lion's hide; the vest made of lions' skins; the twelve labors of *Hercules*; the seven of *Roostem*: all these, and many other points of similarity not mentioned in the *Sketches*, may be examined in *Sir Wm. Ouseley's Travels*, (vol. ii. p. 504.) by those who take an interest in such fanciful researches: and that there are many of this description, appears from the notice which his parallel between *Rustam* and *Hercules* has attracted on the continent, and which, we understand, will induce *Sir William* to publish it in a distinct form.

Reverting for a moment to the "Sketches of Persia," we shall again express our hope that the able and accomplished author will, by a continuation of this work, afford to a multitude of readers both instruction and entertainment.

## CLASSICAL CRITICISM.

IN a note at the end of my 'Brief Refutation of Popery,' published in 1825, I stated it as my opinion, that a powerful philosophical argument against the Unitarians might be drawn from the *Alcestis* of Euripides, and I expressed my wish that some Christian scholar would take up the subject. About two years and a half have now elapsed since the publication of that work, but I have not learned that my suggestion has been adopted; I therefore have resolved to address you: I shall endeavor to be as perspicuous and brief as possible. I formerly observed, that the main argument is this:—*Alcestis* offers to devote herself to death, instead of, and as a ransom for, her husband. Let us examine some of the principal passages in which the subject is particularly mentioned.

πῶς δ' ἂν μᾶλλον ἐνδείξαιτο τις  
πόσιν προτιμᾶται ἢ ἑλ.υς' ὑπερθανεῖν;

How could any one more powerfully demonstrate that she preferred her husband, than by being willing to die in his stead:

*A maid-servant is speaking.*

σὺ δ' ἀντιδοῦσα τῆς ἐμῆς τὰ φίλτατα  
ψυχῆς, ἔσπασας:

But thou, giving in exchange for my life what was most dear to thee, hast saved me.

*Admetus is speaking.*

σύ γε τὴν σαυτᾶ; ἔτλας  
πόσιν, ἀντὶ σᾶς ἀμείψαι  
ψυχᾶς ἐξ ἑσᾶ.

Thou hast dared, instead of thy own life, to save thy husband from Hades.

*Chorus.*

οἶδ' ἀντὶ σοῦ γε κατθανεῖν ὑφειμένην.

I know that she submitted to die in place of thee.

*Hercules is speaking.*

ἐγὼ δέ σ' οἴκων θεσπότην ἐγξινάμην,  
κάθρεψ', ὑφείλων οὐχ ὑπερβήσκειν σέθεν.

I begat thee, that thou shouldst be the master of my house; but not that thou should die for thee.

*Philoctetes speaking to his son Admetus, who had wished him to die instead of his wife.*

μη θνήσχ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ δ' ἀνδρὸς, οὐδ' ἐγὼ πρὸ σοῦ:  
Thou need'st not die for me, nor will I for thee.  
*Pheres is still speaking.*

· εἰ τὴν παροῦσαν καταθεῖναι πείσεις αἰ  
· γυναῖχ' ὑπὲρ σου.  
If thou wilt always persuade her who may be thy wife, to die  
for thee.  
*Pheres is still speaking.*

ἀλλ' οὐ σὺ νεκρὸν ἀντὶ σοῦ κόνδ' ἐκφέρεις.  
But thou shalt not carry forth me a corse, in place of thee.  
*Pheres still speaks.*

Let us now examine some of the principal passages of the  
*New Testament*, in which the death of Christ is spoken of.

κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανε.—Rom. v. 6.

In due time he died for the ungodly.

ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν, Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανε.—Rom.  
v. 8.

While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

Παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν.—Ephes.  
v. 2.

He gave himself up for us, an oblation and a sacrifice.

ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων.—1 Tim. ii. 6.

Who gave himself a ransom in exchange for all.

ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα λυτρώσῃται ἡμᾶς.—Titus ii. 14.

Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us.

διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ ἀποθανόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.—  
1 Thess. v. 9, 10.

By our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us.

Χριστὸς ἀπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἔπαθε, δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων.—1 Peter  
iii. 18.

Christ once suffered in reference to sins, the just, in place of  
the unjust.

Ὅσγε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδω-  
κεν αὐτόν.—Rom. viii. 32.

Who spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us all.

When the reader is comparing and considering the above  
citations, I request him particularly to observe three things.  
First, I have given, I think, *almost all* those passages of Euripides  
which bear on the subject; but in the *New Testament*  
there are *several* passages relating to the sacrifice of Christ,



which I have not adduced. Secondly, it is acknowledged by all, that Alcestis offered herself as a *substitute* for her husband; and yet the preposition *ὕπερ* is employed as often as *ἀντί*. Thirdly, the wife of Admetus is not designated by so strong a term as *ἀντιλutron*. This word, however, is applied by St. Paul to Christ. It is therefore manifest, that the evidence for Christ's devoting himself as a vicarious sacrifice, is much fuller and much stronger than the evidence for Alcestis' devoting herself.

But how does the learned Unitarian act? He admits at once that the Alcestis is to be understood as all scholars understand it; and he rejects *in toto* the great and glorious doctrine of the atonement, although it be more fully and more powerfully established. Is this acting like a rational being? Is this worthy of a man? The result of our examination is clearly this:—If we may be certain that the wife of Admetus, in the tragedy, devotes herself to death as a substitute for her husband; much more may we be assured, that Christ offered up himself as a ransom, satisfaction, and vicarious sacrifice, in the place of guilty, condemned sinners. Let him refute me who can; but let not the Unitarian answer me by sneers and ridicule, nor even by reasoning against what he calls the unreasonableness of the doctrine. This would be foreign to the subject. My reason is as good as his; and as I shall not admit what he asserts, he will be guilty of a *petitio principii*. I wish to bring him to the bar, or rather the *arena* of philology. Let him meet me there. What is the exact, critical meaning of the above-quoted passages?

H. S. BOYD.

Malvern Wells, Jan. 1828.

*Postscript.*—Since the above letter was written, it has occurred to me, that an Unitarian may thus endeavor to elude the force of my argument:—"We believe that Alcestis offered to die as a substitute for her husband, because we are so informed by Apollo, in the opening of the tragedy." But I ask, how can we be certain of the exact meaning of Apollo?

His speech is rather too long to be here quoted; but the learned reader will perceive, on examining it, that by the Unitarian system of interpretation, it may be rendered as null and void, as those passages of the Holy Scriptures which relate to the vicarious sacrifice of the Son of God.

If it be lawful to explain away those passages of the Scriptures which refer to Christ's atonement, it is lawful to explain away the declaration of Apollo. If Christ died merely to set

us an example, and to seal his doctrines with his blood, the meaning of Apollo may be simply this—"Alcestis has offered to die, to set to her husband an example of fortitude and resignation, and to prove the magnitude of her affection by the greatness of the sacrifice."

---

## RICARDI BENTLEII

*Emendationes ad L. Annæi Senecæ Opera. 3 tom.*  
8 Amstel. apud D. ELSEVIR. MDCLXXII.

---

### TOMUS I.

#### DE IRA, LIB. I.

CAP. I. P. 3. l. 22. *procurrant*] *præcurrant*.

CAP. V. P. 12. l. 13. *pœna est*] *pœne est*.

CAP. VI. P. 14. l. 4. *nec ira quidem*] *nec ira q.*

CAP. XII. P. 21. l. antepen. *nec in præliis q.*] *ne i. p. q.*

CAP. XVI. P. 38. l. 14. *nec amari q.*] *ne amari q.*

#### DE IRA, LIB. II.

CAP. V. P. 47. l. 15. *crudelitatis*] *crudelitati*.

CAP. VI. P. 48. l. 12. *Atque*] *Atqui*.

CAP. VII. P. 49. l. pen. *sati*] *satis*.

CAP. XIII. P. 59. l. 9, 10. *affe-ctus?*] *et excedas*.

CAP. XVI. P. 62. l. 1. *Præpone, Ingenia immansueta—*  
*suoque.*

l. 5. *nec illis q.*] *ne illis q.*

CAP. XXXI. P. 82. l. 7. *inter pocula*] *inter colla*.

CAP. XXXII. in not. 2. col. 2. P. 83. *Pacuvius—dabunt]*  
*danunt.*

CAP. XXXIV. P. 87. l. 14, 15. [*Ne irascamur inimicorum*  
*et hostium liberis*] *dele.*

CAP. XXXV. P. 89. l. 13. *qui cum ambulare vult, currit.* Ne-  
mini hic mendii suspicio suborta est, licet manifesto sese prodatur:  
adeo ut fere pro mendo typographico habuissem, nisi omnes,  
quas equidem vidi, editiones ita exhiberent: quis enim unquam  
audivit, senem, aut infirmi corporis ægrotum currere posse, aut  
cursum pro infirmitatis signo esse accipiendum? quare vix du-  
bium, quin legendum hic fuerit, *qui, cum ambulare vult, corrui*:  
sensu, me iudice, manifesto et perspicuo. *Observat. Crit. in*  
*Gr. et Lat. auct. lib. i. cap. 26.* Immo vero tu, eruditissime

vir, locum minime mendosum cum emendare velles, manifesto et perspicuo lapsu, me iudice, corruisti: agit eo in loco Seneca de Ira: quæ, cujus animum occupavit, eum suæ potestatis esse non sinit; quem propterea illis comparat, qui, nervorum vitio atque imbecillitate, incesum suum regere non valentes, cum ambulare, hoc est gradatim incedere, sibi proposuerint, præcipitatis tamen gressibus, et impetu currentium vel inviti feruntur. [Lagomarsinius ad J. Poggiani Epist. vol. i. p. 195.]

## DE IRA, LIB. III.

- CAP. II. P. 95. l. 18. *eloquio favorabilis, habitus in.*  
 CAP. IV. P. 99. l. 17. *nec liber q.] ne liber q.*  
 CAP. V. P. 101. l. 8. *sine viribus] sine viris.*  
 CAP. VII. P. 104. l. 4. *sequuntur actorem; ingentia, et s. m. agentis.*  
 CAP. VIII. P. 108. l. 3. *irasceret iratus.*  
 CAP. XIII. P. 116. l. 2. 3. *con-spicimus] consipimus.*  
 CAP. XV. P. 118. l. 13. 14. *Non vero—, non vero] Non veto—, non veto.*  
 CAP. XVII. P. 121. l. 15. *in-usitatum] in-visitatum.*  
 CAP. XXI. P. 129. l. antepen. *cumculis] sulculis.* Lucan. iv. 142.  
 CAP. XXII. P. 130. l. ult. *existimant] existimabant.*  
 CAP. XXIII. l. P. 132. l. 14. *Demochares—conf. Rhun-kenium ad Rut. Lup. p. 9.*  
 CAP. XXVIII. P. 139. l. 12. *et quando amabis] ecquando amabis?*  
 CAP. XXXII. P. 144. l. 7. *Quomodo, inquis?*  
 CAP. XXXVI. P. 149. l. 14. *mihi transeo] nihil transeo.*  
 CAP. XXXIX. P. 153. l. 10. *notavit R. B.*

## EPIGRAMMATA super exilio.

- CAP. I. P. 162. V. v. 10. *Inque tuam.*  
 VI. l. *Dum sua.*  
 P. 162. v. 2. *Si plorem, risus,*  
 VII. v. 10. *Quo solo careat si quis, in.*

## DE CONSOLAT. AD HELV.

- CAP. II. P. 163. l. 3. *conspici] concipi.*  
 CAP. VI. P. 172. l. ult. *intolerabile est?*  
*hanc frequentiam] istam fr.*  
 P. 173. l. 7, 8. *la-tam] laxam.*  
 P. 176. l. 3. *Omnia volvuntur, semper in.*

CAP. XI. P. 191. l. 6. *quoniam quidem*] *quandoquidem*.

l. antepén. et pen. *fuit nā—esset*] *fuitne—esset*?

CAP. XII. P. 192. l. 8. notavit R. B.

CAP. XIV. l. 14. *diducis?*—*possuunt*.

CAP. XV. P. 196. l. 6, 7. *Ego—frūor*] *Ergo—frūor*?

CAP. XVI. P. 199. l. ult.] vi: p. 272. l. 1, 2.

P. 200. l. 1. *dedisset*] *ademisset*.

l. 15. *sequeris*] sic R. B.

P. 201. l. 18. *voluisset*] *noluisset*.

CAP. XVII. P. 205. l. 7. *Elit*] *etiam firmissimis*.

DE CONSOLAT. AD POLYB.

CAP. XXIII. P. 212. l. 5. *nec ex indigno q.*] *ne ex indigno q.*

CAP. XXV. P. 216. l. 5. *regi possunt*] *leg. tegi p.*

l. 16, 17. *at-tem*] *tantum*.

l. 23. *nēc somnum*] *ne somnum*.

CAP. XXVI. P. 217. l. 8. *audire possis*.

l. 14. *modo est, fabu-*

l. 17. *domos*] *somnos*.

CAP. XXVIII. P. 221. l. 24. *Nilil, ne*.

CAP. XXX. P. 223. l. 10. n. 1. *De 'Anaxagora'*] *'Tela-*  
*mone.* Cic. Tuscul. iii. 13.

l. 11. *Ego cum*.

l. 17. *Iluic rei sus-*

P. 224. l. 17. *rebus*] *verbis*.

l. 24. *decidit*] (sic R. B.)

CAP. XXXVI. P. 237. l. 9. *quoniam quidem*] *quandoquidem*.

CAP. XXXVII. P. 238. l. 7. *ex toto mærgus*] *ex toto non*  
*mæreas*.

l. 8. *Et scio*] *Etsi scio*.

l. 18. *emotæ*] *motæ*.

DE CONSOLAT. AD MARC.

CAP. II. P. 245. l. 12. [Vide D. R. ad Paterc. xi. 30.]

CAP. V. P. 252. l. 2. *concupicris perversissimè*] *in gloriam*.

l. 6. *nec gubernatoris q.*] *ne gubernatoris q.*

CAP. VII. P. 254. l. 6. *orbationem*] Sic editiones; *ambi-*  
*tionem* Mss. et Gronovius; *orbitatem* Pincianus; *abitionem*  
Lipsius, Juretus, Gruterus; *amissionem* Withofius in Add. et  
Corr. ad Præm. Crit.]

CAP. IX. P. 256. l. 8. *periturus*] *perituras*.

CAP. XIII. P. 266. l. 13. *perfecit*.

CAP. XVI. P. 272. l. 1.] vi: p. 199.

CAP. XVII. P. 276. l. 18. *maledictum sit*] *maledictum sint.*

CAP. XVIII. P. 279. l. 2, 3. *inquietis et—aqvis, immani et.*

CAP. XXII. P. 290. l. ult. *nec imponi q.] ne imponi q.*

P. 296. col. 2. n. 6. [*Sic te gere*] p. 298. v. 4.

CAP. XXV. P. 297. l. 19, 20. *Scipiones, Catonesque, utique contemptores vitæ et mortis beneficio liberi*] *lego aniq;* i. e. *animique.* Et in pura pagina, "Corrige, *anq;* id est, *animique.* Ex Virgilio haustum. *Es hic* est animus lucis contemptor. (scribi solet *aique.*)

#### DE PROVIDENTIA.

CAP. I. P. 303. l. pen. *miracula sunt*] *miraculo sunt* Ms.

CAP. II. P. 305. l. 7. *eveniunt?*

l. 11. *nec remittunt q.] ne remittunt q.*

P. 307. l. 15, 16. *fractis, stantem nihilominus.*

CAP. IV. P. 316. l. M. *adepto Honore.*

l. 12. *es: Item.*

P. 318. l. 14. *quoque] quæque.*

l. 16. *explorent iter.] explorent interdiu.*

#### DE TRANQUILL. ANIMI.

CAP. I. P. 339. l. 16, 17. [*elati. In studiis puto meretricule melius esse res ipsas intueri, et harum causa loqui, ceterum*] dele Ms. Lipsii. et ad L. not. in l. adscripsit in margine, "Non."

l. 17, 18. *re-bus]* dele.

P. 340. l. 4. *cogitationis]* *cogitationum.*

l. 6. *exit oratio]* *exigitur oratio.*

CAP. II. P. 344. l. 17. *et mille fluctus]* *et ille fluctus.*

l. 18. *inchoata—, deplorata tr.] spes inchoatæ —, deploratæ tr.*

P. 346. l. 12. *rabidarum]* *tabidarum.*

CAP. X. P. 365. l. 2. *quam quod cum.*

CAP. XV. P. 381. l. 6. notavit R. B.

#### DE CONSTANT. SAPIENTIS.

CAP. II. P. 391. l. antepen. *Nullum]* *Nullam.*

l. pen.] 393, 3.

l. ult.] 395, 3.

CAP. IV. P. 396. l. 1. *contingi?] constringi?*

CAP. V. P. 397. l. 19. *nec inclinari q.] ne inclinari q.*

CAP. VII. P. 403. l. 5. *ut curram]* *ut non curram.*

CAP. VIII. l. 17, 18. *nec prodesse q.] ne prodessa q.*

P. 404. l. 12. *nec a fortuna q.] ne a fortuna q.*

CAP. IX. P. 406. l. 7. *in altum*—Recte: vid. p. 502, 3.

l. 17. *et movet, et impedit.* Ubi liquido legendum est, *Et movet, et impellit.* R. B. ad Hor. Serm. l. iii. 65.

CAP. XII. P. 409. l. 9. notavit R. B.

CAP. XV. P. 415. l. 11. *Desinite igitur dicere.*

CAP. XVII. P. 418. l. 11. *depilatum] depilumatum.*

P. 419. l. 4. *Valinium*—vide; Ruhnkenium ad Paterc. ii. 69.]

CAP. XIX. P. 423. l. pen. et ult. *Re-publica] re publica.*

#### DE CLEMENTIA, LIB. I.

CAP. I. P. 428. l. 4. *ad anni gustum] dele anni.*

CAP. II. P. 429. l. pen. *quoniam quidem] quandoquidem.*

CAP. III. P. 430. l. 13. *Prima erit manumissionis*, notavit R. B. [*P. e. manuductionis* maluit Lipsius; *P. e. commendationis* alii; *P. e. mappamissionis* suspicabatur Gronovius; *P. e. autem necessitatis* correxit Withofius in Add. et Corr. ad Præm. Crit.]

CAP. V. P. 434. l. 12, 13. *nec deprecaturus quidem] ne deprecaturus q.*

CAP. VII. P. 437. l. 10. *nec eo quidem] ne eo q.*

CAP. VIII. P. 438. l. 10. *esse, tibi servitutem?] esse libertatem, l. s.*

CAP. XII. P. 448. l. 14, 15. *nam ut invisus sit, quia timetur, et tineri vult, quia invisus est] nam cum i. q. timetur, tineri — dele et.*

P. 449. l. antep. *aliena anima abuti] Ejus quem timent, in illum potius ruere.* Lipsius. Imo, quasi non amplius sua; ob pericula. R. B.

CAP. XIII. P. 450. l. 22. *quamquam] notavit R. B.; qui ad calcem qui non suggestit; sed postea mutata sententia delevit.*

P. 451. l. 1. *etiam inquis acerbus] etiam inquis non acerbis.*

CAP. XIV. P. 452. l. 1. *deplorata est] deplorarum est.*

l. 9. *temperatissima] temperantissima.*

CAP. XVI. P. 455. l. 18. *contundet enim.*

CAP. XX. P. 460. l. 16. solet, 'si'] dele.

CAP. XXVI. P. 467. l. 4. *secura] securi.*

#### DE CLEMENTIA, LIB. II.

CAP. I. P. 471. l. 2. *Animadversus] Animadversurus.*

l. 3. *notus] notavit R. B.*

CAP. IV. P. 167. l. 21. *Et] At.*

CAP. VI. P. 480. l. pen. et ult. *Vultum quidem non dejiciet, nec animum, ob æruscantis civis aridam ac pannosam maciem, et innixam baculo senectutem:] leg. ob crus alicujus aridum, R. B. Et in pura pagina, lege, Vultum quidem non dejiciet nec animum, ob crus alicujus aridum, aut pannosam maciem, et innixam baculo senectutem.*

DE BREVI TATE VITÆ.

CAP. III. P. 488. l. 16. *Quoniam quidem] quandoquidem.*

P. 489. l. 6. *quantum rex] quantum reus 496, 3. 517, ult.*

CAP. V. P. 491. l. 6. *sudores] sudoris.*

CAP. VI. P. 493. l. 16. *nec puero quidem] ne puero q.*

CAP. VII. P. 496. l. ult. *tanquam vitam] tanquam ultimam.*

CAP. X. P. 501. l. 2. notavit R. B.

P. 502. l. 14. *districtis.*

CAP. XII. P. 504. *ult. vinctorum] an circulatorum, vel, cincinnatorum?*

P. 506. l. pen. *succensus] secessus.*

l. ult. *Nec illos q.] Ne illos q.*

CAP. XIV. P. 513. l. 7. *vocabit] vacabit.*

l. 8. *dimittit] dimittet.*

CAP. XV. P. 514. l. antepen. *quoniam quidem] quandoquidem.*

CAP. XVII. P. 517. l. ult. *Accusandi] ad n. 5. recte 489, 6*

CAP. XVIII. P. 519. l. 9. *publicas] varias.*

DE VITA BEATA.

CAP. I. P. 526. l. 3. *Quoniam quidem] Quandoquidem.*

CAP. II. P. 527. l. 5, 6. *factum sit] jactu sit.*

P. 528. l. 9. *levius fuit quam.*

CAP. III. P. 529. l. pen. *pulcherrima] notavit R. B.*

CAP. VII. P. 532. l. 20. *cedatque] so. sedeatque- et in manu recentiori—sic Ms.*

CAP. XII. P. 542. l. ult. *veritas] virilitas.*

P. 545. l. 6. notavit R. B.

CAP. XIV. P. 544. l. 5. *sortiris] sortitis.*

P. 545. l. 5, 6. *habentes] habenti.*

CAP. XV. l. 22. *Nec gaudium quidem] Ne g. q.*

P. 547. l. 10. *sacramentum] Ms.*

CAP. XVII. P. 550. l. 4, 5. *debilis cursor] debiles, cursor.*

CAP. XXV. P. 563. l. 7. *improvisum est enim a me ne] provisum e. e. a me, ne.*

CAP. XXVI. P. 566. l. 17—19. [*Hoc verbum Ms. non, ut*

*plerique existimant, a favore trahitur: sed imperatur silentium, ut rite peragi possit sacrum, nulla voce mala obstrepente]* dele.

CAP. XXVII. P. 567. l. 1. *ex illo]* lege, *ex illa, vel, ex illis.*

CAP. XXVIII. P. 570. l. ult. [*rapit*] dele Ms.

DE OTIO SAPIENTIS.

CAP. XXVIII. P. 572. l. 6. *Circi]* Cur Ms.

CAP. XXXI. P. 575. l. ult. *pluresve]* *pluresna.*

CAP. XXXII. P. 578. l. pen. et ult. *hominem divini spiritus esse partem.*

l. ult. *sacrorum]* *astrorum.*

P. 580. l. 14. *Quid si]* *Quod si.*

DE BENEFICIIS, LIB. I.

CAP. I. P. 587. l. 4. *dandum.*

l. 5. *accepit. Nec tarde quidem]* *accepit: ne t. q.*

l. 7. *noluit.*

P. 588. l. antepen. *prædicatur]* *præciditur.*

CAP. III. P. 591. l. pen. et ult. *vires servavit]* *servat* Ms. Reg. In nota Ms. Naz. *Ideo est aliqua, tamen majoris dignatio—* 'deest' Ms. Reg.: *sicut promerentium vultus hilari sunt—* -tus -res Ms. Reg.; lege, *vultu hilari* R. B.: *iguales solent esse qui dant et accipiunt beneficia—vel accipiunt* Ms. Reg.

Ms. Lipsii: *Ideo est a. tentum m. d.—vultus hilares sunt—vel accipiunt.*

P. 592. l. 4. *alligati—adscripti]* Ms. *alligatum—adscriptum: in n. col. 2. indignatio]* *dignatio.*

P. 594. l. 5. *Parthæan appellavit, et in]* *P. a., et ait in.*

l. 6. *produxit]* *promisit, Ms.*

l. 7, 8. *spissis auro Phrygianis prodeant]* Ms. *spisse ut Phrygiades prodeant. Ms. Lips. spissis a phrytianis.*

P. 595. l. 5. *ratione]* Ms. Lips.

*reddendique beneficii]* *que dele; ipso beneficio.*

l. 7. *Hecaton]* *hecato.*

l. 9. *quam Horus]* dele.

l. 13. *poetæ]* *poeta.*

l. 14. *reddant]* *reddat.*

l. 15. *cuiusque]* *cujuscunque.*

P. 596. l. 2. *quæque]* *quemque.*

l. 3. *fraudi est, si aliud quid]* *fraudem si aliqd.*

l. 4. *illa]* *illas.*

CAP. IV. l. 9. *nec circa r. q.] ne circa r. q.*

l. 12. *te. re]* dele.



l. 14. *Hoc vero*] *hic vero*.

l. 20. *magnum ipsis*] *magnum in ipsis*.

l. 21. *proponere—animoque*] *dele — animeque*.

P. 597. l. 2. *nisi præcessit*] *non præcessit*.

l. 6. *se grate*] *sacrate*.

l. 10. *præstiterint*] *præstiterunt*.

CAP. V. l. 20. *discendum*] *dicendum*.

l. 21. *dicit*] *dele*.

P. 598. l. 2. *animo gēritur*] *sed a. g. geritur* Ms. *animo cernitur*, ubi librario Codicis Vossiani necessarium visum est *sed* immittere : *sed a. c. Rhunkenius ad Paterc. ii. 72*.

l. 5, 6. *ocu-lis incurrit,—possidentque*] *los occ — possidetur*.

l. 10. *beneficium vero, etiam*] *beneficium etiam*.

P. 599. l. 1. *Hoc quoque in aliis*] *Hoc in aliis quoque*.

CAP. VI. l. 19. *rector animus impellat,—forma datur rebus*] *rector impellat,—forma rebus datur*.

P. 600. l. 1. *nec in victimis*] *nec victimis*.

l. 2. *honos*] *honor*.

*sed pia ac recta*] *recta ac pia*.

l. 3. *fritilla*] *vino*.

CAP. VII. l. 6. *non in ipsa*] *non ipsa*.

l. 8. *accepimus*] *accipimus*.

l. 14. *recepturus*, sic Ms.

l. 16. *quasiuit*] *quæsiit*.

P. 601. l. 2. *gratius venit, quod*] *gratius quod*.

CAP. VIII. l. 15. *michi magnum munus*] *magnum munus mihi*.

15, 16. *te æstimas parvo?*

CAP. IX. l. 23. *nihilominus dignum*] *dignum nihilominus?*

l. 25. *fuisse, qui pretium*] *fuisse pretium*.

P. 602. l. 5. *At peior*] *aptior*.

l. 6. *gravis,—explicuit*] *gratus—explicuit*.

l. 8, 9. *nec clam qui-dam*] *lege, ne clam quidem*.

P. 603. l. 1. *abominanda conditio est, \* \* \* conjugem in*] *abominandæ conditionis est, \* \* \* conjugem suam in*.

l. 2, 3. *undi-que perspicuam*] *perspicuam undique*.

l. 4. *anulum præstat* Ms.

#### DE BENEFICIIS, LIB. II.

CAP. IV. P. 619. l. 2. *daturus est*] *daturus es*.

CAP. VII. P. 621. l. 3. *M. Allio*] *M. elio* Ms. *Regius*.

l. 10. *ista fortasse*] *ita fortasse*.

l. 11. *efficax ratio fuerit*] *efficax fuerit*.

CAP. VIII. l. ult. et p. 622, l. 1, 2. ad not. 3. *Tentemus*

quid ostendat, Naz. in quo et duobus Pall. ac Rot. *tamen inquit effugere Tiberius ne hoc quidem modo quod vitabat potuit* : sic quoque Ms. [Reg.]

P. 622. l. 5. *est : non auxilium] est : auxilium.*

CAP. X. P. 623. l. 2, 3. *ignorantis] ignorantis.*

l. 7, 8. *nesciat accepisse se] nesciet accepisse sed.*

P. 624. l. 7. *Quidni?] quam.*

l. 8. *illi non sum] illi sum.*

l. 12. *premit frequens meritorum] premit meritorum.*

CAP. XI. l. 17. *ego te eripui] ego eripui.*

l. ult. *est instandum] est notandum.*

CAP. XVI. P. 631. l. 13. *non grande] nisi grande.*

l. 15. *non convenire fortunæ suæ] fortunæ suæ non convenire.*

CAP. XVII. P. 632. l. 4, 5. *ejusmodi cavillatio turpißima est] t. ejusmodi cavillatio est.*

CAP. XXVII. P. 642. l. ult. n. 4. *tam pusilli "Pinciani et mei libri." tempus illi potius Ms. Regius.*

P. 643. l. 1, 2. *emittebat,—inopia erat] enutriebat—copia inerat.*

l. 5. *subinde Augusto] leg. subinde de Augusto.*

#### DE BENEFICIIS, LIB. III.

CAP. XIX. P. 674. l. 6. *eo magis sit] eo majus sit.*

CAP. XXIII. P. 676. l. 13. *tradidit,—Grumentum] Ms. Reg. del. —gumentum.*

CAP. XXVII. P. 680. l. 15. *crederet] crederet.*

l. ult. *fasti-diendam a] fastidiendam etiam a Ms. Reg.*

P. 681. l. 1, 2. *Honeste Cæsar] Honeste jecit Cæsar.*

l. 4. *Num ex-] non ex-*

l. 5. *manumissum] manuantemissum.*

CAP. XXVIII. l. 8. *num est dubium] non dubium est.*

CAP. XXXIV. P. 689. l. ult. *vo-luntarium] lege, volaplarium.*

#### DE BENEFICIIS, LIB. IV.

CAP. VIII. P. 705. l. 10. *Si quid a] leg. Si quod a.*

CAP. IX. P. 706. l. 8. *nec agricolæ q.] ne agricolæ q.*

CAP. XII. P. 712. l. 1. *quoto anno emturus] quanto e.*

CAP. XIII. P. 718. l. 1. *minutior] munitior.*

CAP. XXVII. P. 726. l. ult. *nec audacem q.] ne audacem q.*

CAP. XXXI. P. 731. l. pen. *Quid ergo?*

CAP. XXXVII. P. 740. l. 9. *justus unus] Ms. Reg. justo.*

l. 13. *Hoc Philippus] hæc Philippus.*

l. pen. *propter quod*] *pro quo*.

l. ult. *miserari miseros*] *misereri misericors*.

DE BENEFICIIS, LIB. V.

CAP. III. P. 749. l. 1. *quoniam quidem*] *quandoquidem*.

CAP. IV. P. 750. l. 7. *Onæ*] *Nonne*.

CAP. VI. P. 752. l. pen. *Etiamnum*] *Et enim*.

CAP. X. P. 758. l. 6. *Etiamnum*] *Et enim*.

CAP. XIV. P. 760. l. 15. 19. *Etiamnum*] *Et enim*.

P. 761. l. 2. *apud nos*] *apud eos*.

CAP. XVII. P. 769. l. 9. *Cui, rogo*] *Cui reo*.

CAP. XIX. P. 771. l. 16. *Etiamnum*] *Et enim*.

DE BENEFICIIS, LIB. VI.

CAP. XV. P. 796. l. 22. *pro tempore est*] *lege, pro emptore est*.

CAP. XXX. P. 810. l. 20. *Nec ex hoc q.*] *Ne ex hoc q.*

CAP. XXXIII. P. 816. l. 8. *contuleris?*

l. 13. *interesse*.

CAP. XXXVIII. P. 823. l. 1. *exoptat*] *f. exaltat*. Sic Quæst. Natur. III. præf. Ita quoque emendat R. B. ad Hor. Carm. I. xxiv. 13.

CAP. XLII. P. 826. l. 12. notavit R. B.

DE BENEFICIIS, LIB. VII.

CAP. I. P. 830. l. 1. *toluissent*] *toluissem*.

CAP. IV. P. 836. l. 15. *domino quoque*] *domino quaque*.

CAP. IX. P. 843. l. 5, 6. *nec daturus q.*] *ne daturus q.*

CAP. XXI. P. 858. l. 13. *non præsentibus*] *deleverat* R. B.; sed sententiam mutavit.

CAP. XXV. P. 861. l. 17. *admonitio, non convitium*] *admonitio, contitium*.

CAP. XXVII. P. 864. l. 3. *nec religio q.*] *ne religio q.*

CAP. XXIX. P. 866. l. 1, 2. *quoniam quidem*] *quandoquidem*.

l. 5. *sapiens conditor*] *patiens creditor*; et in pura pagina, 'Quadam nomina bona lentus ac sapiens conditor fecit: lege creditor. Contrarium est illi dicto sceneratoris Alfii, Bona nomina non appellando mala fieri. Et sic emendat R. B. ad Hor. Epist. II. l. 105.

CAP. XXX. P. 867. l. 2. *quærendo*] notavit R. B.

CAP. XXXI. P. 869. l. 7. *repente*] *tcpente*.

T. K.

*Athenian Elegance delineated; or, a Critical Inquiry into the Principles and Laws of the Grecian Tragic Poetry.*

Omnino causæ prius investigandæ sunt, quam regulæ constituendæ.

HERMANN.

PREFACE.

IN presenting the following treatise to the public, it is not necessary to expatiate on the pleasure to be experienced in, or the advantages to be derived from classical pursuits; nor is it requisite to eulogise the study of that particular portion of classical literature, to which the subsequent pages have reference. We shall content ourselves with one or two remarks, affecting the peculiarities of the work itself.

A careful perusal of the disputations of the learned, on the various points included under the general head of metrical science, convinced the author of the importance of fixing some determinate principles of recitation; of forming, by the application of these principles, a plan of recitation for each species of verse; and of making this plan of recitation the basis of every illustration of elegance; more especially of regarding it as containing the reason of every restriction imposed on the score of metre. These views were not a little confirmed by the failure of all attempts to arrange, from the materials furnished by the several critics, a clear, precise, and consistent metrical system for Athenian tragedy; and the author was thus likewise compelled either to relinquish the subject altogether, or to enter on one sufficient to call forth all the sagacity and application of Porson or Bentley. Not without hesitation he chose the latter; and with a view to the accomplishment of his object, he has read, studied, and reasoned; and the result of his investigations, as far as relates to Tragic poetry, he here submits to the judgment of the learned reader.

With regard to the execution of the work, the writer has but little to say. He is free to confess, that he has with others his favorite critics, but he is not aware of having been influenced by prejudice in the choice; and it has been his constant study, in the discussion of every topic, to animadvert with candor and impartiality. Nothing, it may be added, is to him more unpleasant, than the perusal of personal sarcasms and reproaches, especially in works of a philological nature; and he trusts, that the animation of debate has not betrayed him into any expressions inconsistent with this declaration. An air of triumphant superiority little befits those who are engaged in the discovery of truth, and who are undeniably indebted, in no inconsiderable degree, to the labors of their less privileged predecessors.

Bristol.

H. W. W.

## CHAPTER I.

General principles of recitation; and the Anapaestic versés of the Attic Tragedians.

IT is agreed among prosodians, that *quantity, accent, pause*, and the several modulations of voice denominated *tones*, including *emphasis*, are the figures employed in the recitation of every composition. The first respects the time occupied in the pronunciation of syllables, as being long or short, without determining (if the expression may be allowed) the exact degree of length or shortness. Accent may be defined, the stress of voice comprising both loudness and acuteness, laid on a certain syllable of every word, except a few short unimportant ones, termed by the Greeks enclitics; and serves to enable the ear rightly to distinguish the words of a sentence from each other, in addition to affording it an agreeable variety. In Greek prose, the mark of accent is placed over the syllable to be accented, and is often of service in pointing out the true signification: under this impression it is likewise continued in poetry, according to the position of the accent in prose. Here we may observe, that in English, accent or syllabic emphasis is of the same importance as quantity was in the languages of Greece and Rome; and it appears, that in the latter, accent was regarded as an object of secondary importance in comparison of quantity, and thus the poet scrupled not to alter its position, from a certain syllable of every word to a certain syllable of every foot. Pauses may be classed under two general heads, vocal and sentential. Not indeed that these distinctions are precisely correct; the vocal pauses enabling the speaker to proceed with propriety in his discourse, and thus assisting the sense, and the sentential being altogether indispensable to continued utterance. The former takes place in prose at the end of every word of importance; but are imperceptible to the hearer, unless particularly attentive to the recitation, on account of their extreme shortness. But let it be carefully observed, that this remark is applicable only to those species of composition which require to be recited deliberately; the vocal pauses may be, in all others, neglected with propriety. The sentential pauses of the Greeks, were the comma, colon, and period, besides some extraordinary ones occasionally employed; all of which, as well as emphasis, or a peculiar intension of voice on certain words to give them prominence, and the other modulations of the voice, contributed to display the true meaning of the speaker in all its fulness and nicety. There is, in the above observations, scarcely one particular that will not command the most ready assent, if we except that which refers to the vocal pauses: and even this can, in our judgment, scarcely be called in question. We ask, how is it that in the case of the word *σπαρία* succeeded by a word beginning with a vowel or diphthong, a hiatus occurs

after the word, (we now speak of prose,) but no hiatus occurs after the penultimate *ι*, followed by the vowel *α*? The remark may be prosecuted to a considerable extent, but the nature of our present subject compels us to rest here.

The general question, 'in what manner was the poetry of the ancient Greeks recited?' may accordingly be considered as resolving itself into the more particular one, 'with what modifications are these remarks to be applied to poetry?' And in reference to those kinds of poetry which are in themselves dignified and weighty, particularly the epic and tragic, we unhesitatingly advance the following doctrine, grounded in maxims the most clear and evident. It can scarcely be argued, that the ancient Greeks recited these species of poetry in the same manner as prose: this would be, in a language like the Greek, to render poetry a mere succession of long and short syllables in a prescribed order; and poetry of this description could not be equal to finished prose. Equally ridiculous is the hypothesis, that the Greeks in the recitation of their poetry attended solely to the feet; no Homeric or Athenian audience would have tolerated for a moment the monotonous drawl of scanning, or have listened to an orderly succession of long and short syllables, often unintelligible, and never conveying any of those nice and forcible distinctions of meaning peculiarly characteristic of the writings of that polished people. Metrical beauty was doubtless made to consist with excellence of idea and of expression: the several figures above enumerated were doubtless so employed, as to distinguish both the true meaning and the true prosodial character of each verse, without giving an undue prominence to either. And this could best be done, we conceive, by employing emphasis, tones, and the sentential pauses, in behalf of the sense, but using accent and the vocal pauses according to the dictates of the metre. The former figures could not be otherwise employed with any degree of consistency; and it was necessary to accent the verses as composed of feet, and to regulate the vocal pauses by the particular nature of each kind of verse, in order to make the proper distinction between poetry and prose. Quantity, as before observed, was the most essential particular in Greek poetry, and had an equal bearing on the meaning and the numbers of a verse. With respect to the vocal pauses, which may in these cases be styled with greater propriety *metrical* pauses, as being under the direction of the metre, they were made after the feet or dipodes, according as the species was recited by feet or dipodes; but it may be considered, that the pause after a foot or dipode ending in the middle of a word, was equal to that at the termination of an important word in prose, but that the pause after a foot or dipode ending with a word, was about double the former in length. In Heroic poetry, the cæsural pause, which appears to have been equal to the common vocal pause, took place after the first

and emphatic syllable of the dactyl or spondee when it terminated a word; and in those kinds of verse which were recited by dipodes, it is more than probable that the less metrical pause, corresponding in a sense to the one just named, was made after the first foot of a dipode terminating with a word. Recited correctly in all these respects, as they undoubtedly were by the ancient bards and actors, the Grecian Epic and Tragic poetry must have displayed to the Grecian ear, both a rich exuberance of variety, and a beautiful and engaging uniformity; and we shall not, we hope, be accused of arrogance by our readers, if we claim for this basis of our metrical doctrine, the need of superior rationality and consistency.

We have now to apply these general principles to the anapæstic verses of the Attic tragedians. These verses were composed of anapæsts  $\cup\cup$ -, dactyls  $- \cup \cup$ , and spondees  $--$ ; and allowed, in cases of necessity, of a proceleusmatic  $\cup\cup\cup\cup$ . They were employed both in the choruses of the tragedies, and in separate systems of dimeters or verses containing four feet, with one or more monometers occasionally intermixed, and closed by a pæoniac or dimeter catalectic. Some critics have objected to the term dimeter being applied to anapæstic verses composed of four feet, arguing that the anapæst, being equal in the time of pronunciation to the dactyl, has the same right as the latter foot, to be considered *a metre* of itself. But a moment's reflection will convince us of the propriety of the common designation: for it cannot be questioned, that a foot constituted a metre in those verses which were read by feet, but two feet in those which were read by dipodes; and the names assigned to the two kinds of verse, serve to show us that the dactylic is of the former, and the anapæstic of the latter description. Accordingly, after each dipode, either the greater vocal pause designated thus |, or the less thus, occurred, as the dipode terminated at the end, or in the middle of a word; also, the less occurred after the first foot of each dipode when it ended with a word. The anapæst, according to the general rule for the accentuation of feet, which mentions the long syllable of the foot as that which receives the accent, and the principal foot of the verse as determining the accent of those which have, in this respect no decisive character, unquestionably received the accent, or more properly the metrical accent, on the last syllable; the dactyl evidently on the first: the proper method of accenting the spondee is a matter of doubt. In dactylic verses, the dactyl is the only foot to influence the accent of the spondee; and thus the spondee was in these invariably accented on the former syllable. Trochaic admitted trochees, dactyls, anapæsts, tribrachs, and spondees; but the anapæst being an unimportant foot, and never occurring but at the end of a dipode, the accent of the trochee was followed by the tribrach and spon-

dee. Iambic also, though they allowed of a dactyl in the first and third place, yet by refusing to admit the spondee in the second and fourth, annihilated all its pretensions to direct the position of the accent on the latter foot; and it need not be added, that to give the tribrach following the dactyl in the first place the accent of that foot, would be to outrage the most evident principles of metrical beauty. \* In anapæstic verses, on the contrary, the dactyl is admitted as a very important foot, some verses being entirely composed of dactyls and spondees; and this circumstance may produce a hesitation, whether the accent of this foot or of the anapæst should be ascribed to the spondee. \*The learned Dunbar of Edinburgh affirms without any qualification, (An. Maj. tom. 3. part 2. p. 233.) that in anapæstics the anapæst has the ictus metricus on the last syllable, the dactyl and spondee on the first. But we scruple not to say, that this doctrine is both inconsistent with the general rule for the accentuation of feet, and decidedly militates against the elegance of the metre. And to attribute universally to the spondee the ictus of the anapæst, is to disregard all those striking circumstances above alluded to, and will be attended by an injury to the sense equal to that resulting from the position advocated by Professor Dunbar. The truth lies, we conceive, between these two contradictory opinions. As has been already remarked, the anapæstic systems of the Grecian Tragic writers were recited in two dipodes; and these dipodes were anapæstic, dactylic, or spondaic; the first class containing an anapæst, the second a dactyl, and the third two spondees. When a spondee occurred in an anapæstic dipode, it is extremely probable, if not absolutely certain, that it was accented like the anapæst; when in a dactylic, like the dactyl; and in a spondaic it is best to assign to it the ictus of the anapæst. We should, accordingly, thus read the following verses of the Medea of Euripides:

Μη. Δυστάνος ἔγω, μέλαι' ἔρε πόνων,]

Ἰώ|μοι μοί,| πῶς ἄν ὀλέϊμην,]

Τρο. Τῷδε' ἔκείνῳ, φίλῳ|παῖδός·| μαῖη·]

Κίρεϊ | κρηδύειν, | κίρεϊ | δε' χῶλόν·| vss. 95. sqq.

Let it be remembered, that in this extract the metrical pauses are denoted, as they would occur independently of the sentential: every attempt to designate the pauses of the verse, varied as they were by the blending of the sentential and metrical, must prove fruitless. One of the most important features of our system of recitation is, that it supposes two regular metrical pauses of different lengths, which could be lengthened or shortened agreeably to the requisitions of the sense, and the less neglected when occasioned by cæ-sura, or occurring in the middle of a dipode, if called for by the



the ictus παῖ, yet receiving it, we must consider it παῖ. The true reading of the verses, however, appears to be that of Brunck :

"Αγε νῦν σὺ με, παῖ, ἴν' ἂν εὐσεβίας, κ. τ. λ.

Instances of the correctness of the other part of the above rule may be seen in Soph. Antig. 817. Eurip. Med. 1081.

The principle on which we have accounted for the continuity of metre observable in anapæstic systems, will likewise furnish us with the reason of the following remarkable peculiarity ; viz. that those verses are the most beautiful in which each dipode terminates with a word. In verses at the end of which a distinct pause is made, this pause is sufficient to enable the voice to recover its full powers, of whatever length the other pauses of the verse may be ; but as *synapheia* is a distinguishing characteristic of anapæstic collections, and the voice is in consequence deprived of the relief afforded by this pause, it becomes necessary that the other pauses of the verse should be as long as they can with consistency, and, as an important particular, that the longer metrical pause, occupying about half the time of the comma in prose, should be made as frequently as possible at the end of each dipode. Indeed, it is constantly made at the end of the second, except occasionally in the case when a short final vowel is elided ; the natural effect of elision being obviously to unite two separate words. To the *parœmiac*, however, the closing verse of a system, the rule does not apply, as at the end of this verse a period or note of interrogation is almost invariably found ; and indeed the circumstance that it closes a system, would be sufficient to warrant of itself the introduction of a distinct pause.

The third and last important remark on the subject of anapæstic dimeters, with which we are furnished by the researches of learned men, is, that an anapæst should never follow a dactyl. Hermann qualifies the observation, by conceding that it may sometimes, provided it be in different dipodes. This modification of the rule is to a certain extent correct ; but even this is defective. The reason why an anapæst was not allowed to succeed a dactyl in the same dipode, is, that the occurrence of four short *unaccented* syllables would appear an insuperable bar to the proper recitation of the verse, when the less metrical pause did not occur after the first foot of the dipode, and would be extremely unpleasant to the ear when it did. On this principle, when the shorter pause took place at the end of a dipode, if that dipode ended with a dactyl, the following could not begin with an anapæst, this collocation incurring the same disagreeable effect. But when the longer pause occurred, the unpleasantness, though not altogether removed, was materially lessened ; and in this case therefore it was, that the tragedians of Athens occasionally introduced the obnoxious usage.

\*Η τρὺς μογεροῦς καὶ δυσδαΐμονός

\*Ἄρκυνός κλαύσω πολεμάρχους ; Sept. c. Theb. 827, 8.

Θάρσει Πάλλας δὲ σῶϊάν ἤξεις. Eurip. Electr. 1319.

passages already cited by Hermann.

In the *Antigone* of *Sophocles*, there are, according to the text of *Brunck*, two instances of an *anapæst* succeeding a *dactyl* in the same *dipode* ; but the readings of *Erfurdt*, aptly and conclusively defended in his notes, remove every difficulty.

The principles we have just stated, in connexion with our general plan of recitation, suggest to us likewise the following rule ; a rule which the universal practice of the Tragic writers shows to be correct. When a *dipode* ends with a word, the *anapæst*, *pædee*, and *dactyl*, may close this, and begin the following *dipode* indiscriminately ; but when a *dipode* ends in the middle of a word, the closing foot of this and the initial foot of the following *dipode* must not be any one of the subjoined forms :

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{—} \cup \cup \mid \text{—} \text{—} \\ \text{—} \text{—} \mid \cup \cup \text{—} \\ \text{—} \text{—} \mid \text{—} \text{—} \end{array}$$

Besides  $\text{—} \cup \cup \mid \cup \cup \text{—}$  which has been already condemned. In any of these cases, the poetic beauty of the verse or verses would be materially injured by the occurrence of the unaccented syllables with only the common vocal pause between them.

It may be expected that we should here investigate the influence of the *ictus* metrical on the quantity of certain syllables ; but on account of the superior importance of the subject to *Iambic* verses, it has appeared more proper to defer its consideration, and that of the particulars it involves, to the third chapter. We shall, accordingly, merely stay to notice the bearing of a rule there given, on a theory advanced in the preceding pages. It is said, that when no pause is to be made after a syllable, composed of a short vowel, succeeded by an aspirate or soft mute followed by any liquid, by a medial mute followed by the liquid *ρ*, also by *γλ*, and *βλ*, the syllable, though not properly short, is still too short to stand for a long one, but receiving the *ictus*, (which really adds a slight degree of *length* to it,) it assumes an importance that will not allow of its being ranked among short syllables ; and thus its relative quantity is dependent on its reception or want of the metrical accent. This rule, as far as it regards *anapæstics*, is supported by the subjoined passages among others : *Med.* 114. 118. 165. 1091. 1409. 1416 ; *Æd. Col.* 1754 ; *Antig.* 156 ; *Ajac.* 167 ; *Prom. Vinc.* 159 ; *Sept. c. Theb.* 1062 ; *Alc.* 249 ; *Med.* 1408 ; *Antig.* 144 ; *Ajac.* 139 ; *Phil.* 1455 ; *Soph. Electr.* 107 ; *Prom. Vinc.* 140 ; *Sept. c. Theb.* 1059. 1063.

This point being firmly established, it will follow either that our rule for the position of the accent of the spondee is incorrect, or that the three following verses occurring in the plays from which the above examples are taken, have been corrupted by the mistakes of transcribers :

Στείχω, δισσῶν γ' ἄμορος τέκνων. Med. 1392.

Μαλακοῦ χρωτὸς ψαῦσαι τέκνων. Med. 1400.

Ἐδρας προλιπών. Phil. 1414.

But before we embrace the former conclusion, we ought to show that three of the passages above named are corrupt ; viz.

Πλὴν τοῖν στυγεροῖν, ὃ πατὴρ ἐνός, Antig. 144.

Μὴ οὐ, τεκνολέτειρ' ὥς τις ἀηδών, Soph. Electr. 107.

Ἀλλὰ φοβοῦμαι, καπὸτρέπομαι, Sept. c. Theb. 1063.

and although in the second of these, τεκνολέτειρ' may be easily altered to παιδολέτειρ', the first and third, according to our present views, set improvement or satisfactory alteration at defiance. Let us, on the other hand, examine the passages which go to prove that the spondee has invariably the accent of the dactyl, that we may be able to determine whether their authority is sufficient, not only to condemn the readings of the three lines leading to an opposite deduction, but also to overthrow the arguments already alleged. We question whether the first would not be improved by reading,

Στείχω, ἄμοιρος δισσῶν γε τέκνων,

—a lection harmonious in its numbers, and energetic in its expression of the sense. In the second, παίδων may be substituted for τέκνων with propriety, the error having in all probability arisen from the forgetfulness or inattention of the transcribers ; and the third may be corrected with facility and certainty, to

Καθέδρας προλιπών.

The inference we must adopt is, that the theory of the ictus metricus confirms those laws and principles, which we have embraced as naturally arising out of the general and certain principles of recitation, the only sure basis of metrical doctrines.

## ADDENDA.

*Classical Journal*, No. XXXIV.—On Literary Coincidences.

P. 296. col. 1. l. 18. *post* “pp. 51-2.” *insere*, P. 56. *Fiorillo* ad *Æschyli Eumenid.* 224.

*Ibid.* col. 2. l. 20. *post* “242.” *insere*, *Month. Rev. for Feb.* 1796. p. 124.

*Timæus*, p. 93. “Ἔδος, τὸ ἄγαλμα, καὶ ὁ τόπος ἐν ᾧ ἵδρυνται.

[“Dubito, an vox (ēdos) in nostris *Platonis* exemplaribus extet: non reperi certe.”

*Plato Phædo*, p. 111. B. 7. καὶ δὴ καὶ θεῶν ἄλση τε καὶ ἱερὰ αὐταῖς εἶναι· ἔδη pro ἄλση e codicibus Aug. et Paris. restituit optimus *Heindorfius*.] Vergit vir summus; *Æschyl.* Pers. 404. ἐλευθεροῦτε δὲ Παῖδας, γυναῖκας, θεῶν τε πατρώων ἔδη. *Sophocles* *Ced. Tyr.* 886. οὐδὲ δαιμόνων ἔδη σέβων. *Lycurg.* in *Leocrat.* p. 157. Κρίνω προδόντα αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς νεῶς, καὶ τὰ ἔδη, καὶ τὰ τεμένη. *Philo.* T. II. p. 314. ἐπιφοιτᾶν καὶ ἐνδιατρίβειν τοῖς ἔδεσιν: ubi non imiter *Mangeium*, ἱεροῦ addentem. *Herodes Atticus*.

P. 67. “vs. 19. “Ὅσ κε θεῶν ἐδέεσσιν ἀλιτροσύνην ἀναθεῖη] *Æschyl.* Pers. 404. *Porson.* ἐλευθεροῦτε δὲ Παῖδας, γυναῖκας ΘΕΩΝ τε πατρώων ΕΔΗ, Θήκας τε προγόνων.

*Soph.* *Ced. Tyr.* 885. οὐδὲ δαιμόνων ΕΔΗ σέβων.

*Lycophron*, *Alexandra.* 707. Ὅρκωμότους ἔτευξεν ἀφθίτους ΕΔΗ.

## FIORILLO.

*Lycurgus*, in *Leocrat.* p. 157. κρίνω προδόντα αὐτὸν, καὶ τοὺς νεῶς, καὶ τὰ ΕΔΗ, καὶ τὰ τεμένη. *Philo.* T. II. p. 314. ἐπιφοιτᾶν καὶ ἐνδιατρίβειν τοῖς ΕΔΕΣΙΝ. Ubi minime necessarium *Mangeii* additamentum ἱεροῖς. Vid. *Photium Biblioth.* p. 1069. Latinos etiam *sedes* pro templis dicere, exemplis ostendunt *Drakenb.* ad *Sil. Ital.* lib. xii. 48. et *Burm.* ad *Ovid. Met.* l. x. 229. Non minus frequenter ἔδος pro *statua* aut *simulacro* ponitur; vid. infra ad II. 2. ἀναθεῖη.”

Pp. 109, 110. “vs. 2. Ῥηγίλλης ἔδος ἀμφὶ θουοσκῶ ἱρὰ φέρουσαι] \* \* \* \* “Ἔδος—pro *simulacro Deorum* ponitur ap. *Dio-*

## RUHNKENIUS.

*Inscript.* I. 19. “Ὅσ κε θεῶν ἐδέεσσιν ἀλιτροσύνην ἀναθεῖη. Vide *Photium Bibl.* p. 1069. Latinos etiam *sedes* pro *Deorum* templis dicere, exemplis ostendunt. *Drakenborch.* ad *Sil. Ital.* lib. xii. 48. et *Burm.* ad *Ovid. Met.* x. 229. Non minus frequenter ἔδος pro *statua* vel *simulacro* ponitur. *Callim.* Fr. 105. καὶ γὰρ Ἀθήνης Ἐν Λίγδῳ Δαναὸς λιτὸν ἔθηκεν ἔδος. *Dionys.* *Hal.* A. R. i. p. 38. παραλαβὼν καὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὰ ἔδη τῶν θεῶν. *Herodes Atticus Inscript.* II. 2. Ῥηγίλλης ἔδος ἀμφὶ θουοσκόν ἱρὰ φέρουσαι. *Apprianus Mithrid.* p. 717. τὸ δὲ τῆς Ἀθῆνας ἔδος, ὃ Παλλάδιον καλοῦσι.

nys. *Halicarn.* A. R. lib. i. p. 38. παραλαβὼν καὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὰ ἔδη τῶν θεῶν. *Appian.* *Mithrid.* p. 717. τὸ δὲ τῆς Ἀθη-  
νᾶς ἔδος, ὃ παλλαδίων καλοῦσι. Vide præterea de hac voce *Ero-*  
*tianum* et *Thom. Mag. Jungerm.* ad *Polluc.* lib. i. 7. et  
*Toup.* in *Cur. Noviss.* in *Suid.* p. 61. \* \* \*

*Class. Journ.* p. 310. col. 2. l. 2. exhibet. *adde, Athen.* 11. p. 48. C. 5. Σώφρων δὲ, στρούθωτὰ ἐλίγματα, φησιν, ἐκτετυμμένα. Mallem, ΣΤΡΩΤΑ ἐλίγματα, et ἐκτετυμμένα. *Lucret.* ii. 499. *Jam tibi barbaricæ vestes, Melibæaque fulgens Purpura, Thessalico concharum tincta colore.* *Cic. Phil.* 11. xxvii. *Conchyliatis Cn. Pompeii peristromatis servorum in cellis lectos stratos videres.* Sed hæc loca rem parum attingunt.

No. LXXII.—*Curæ Posteriores ad Dawes. Misc. Crit.*

P. 258. l. 2. *corrige*, telo meo.

*Ibid.* l. 29. PRÆF. v.

P. 259. l. 24. "P. ii. col. 2. l. 14. fibra." *dele.*

P. 260. l. 7. eâ ;

P. 264. l. 17. P. 53.

*Ibid.* l. 29. P. 55. n. 47.

P. 265. l. 13, 14. Antistite *dele.*

*Ibid.* *lege*, PEARSONO Antistite,

P. 267. l. 38, 39. ΤΡΟΙΗΝΙΟΙ - ΤΡΟΙΗΝΙΩΝ.

P. 268. l. 5. *insere*, P. 229. col. 2. l. 10—13. "Sic—p. 275." *dele*; et *reponere*; Sic Ὀδυσσεὺς, quem Ὀδυσσοία fecerunt Ἄεoles, ad Ulyssem deductus est. *Quintil.* I. iv. 16.; vide *Kæn.* ad *Greg.* p. 275. Immo *lege*, quem Οὐλύσσεα—a prima positione Οὐλύσσης; unde Latinum *Ulysses*, seu potius *Ulyxes*; vide *Plutarchi* locum supra citatum ad p. 182. Notum est hujusmodi formarum patrum casum ab uno ad alterum declinandi exitum subiunde migrare ac tanquam labi.

P. 270. l. 44. *insere*, P. 513. col. 2. l. 7. post p. 35. *adde*, Euripidis illustre fragmentum apud *Clementem Alexandrinum Strom.* v. p. 688. prout in margine exemplaris penes amicissimum M. D. emendavit *Porsonus*, adscribam; Σοί, τῷ πάντων μεδέοντι, χοῖνι, Πέλανόν τε φέρω, Ζεὺς εἰρ' Αἰδὼς Ὀνομαζόμενος στέργεις· σὺ δέ μοι Θυσίαν ἄπυρον παγκαρκεῖαι Δέξαι πλήρη προχυθεῖσαν. Σὺ γὰρ ἐν τε θεοῖς τοῖς οὐρανίδαις Σκῆπτρον τὸ Διὸς μεταχειρίζεις, Χθονίῳ δ' Αἰδῇ μετέχεις ἀρχῆς· Πέρψον μὲν ὥς ψυχᾶς, ἀνδρῶν τοῖς βουλομένοις ἀβλῶν προμαθεῖς—7. μεταχειρίζων—8. Χθονίῳ—9. ψυχᾶς ἀνδρῶν *Valckenaerius* in *Diatr.* ad *Eur.* fragmenta, p. 42, 3. 2. Ἀτῆς *inscriptam* reliquerunt viri præstantissimi.

P. 272. l. 16. *corrige*, F.

LETTERS  
TO  
MR. ARCHDEACON TRAVIS,  
IN ANSWER TO HIS  
DEFENCE  
OF THE,  
THREE HEAVENLY WITNESSES,

I JOHN v. v.  
By R. PORSON.  
LONDON:—1790.

LETTER III.

Of the Complutensian edition.

"Is fit it should be shown what an arguer he is, and how well he deserves for his performance to be dubbed by himself irrefragable."—LOCKE.

In school-divinity as able  
As he that hight irrefragable,<sup>1</sup>  
A second Thomas, or at once,  
To name them all, another Dun.—HUDIBRAS

Sir,  
WE are now arrived at the Complutensian edition, in which the "honest bigotry" of the editors has inserted the doubtful text. By "honest bigotry" Mr. Gibbon probably means, that the editors thought the verse genuine indeed, but inserted it contrary to their Greek Mss. If they thought it genuine on such slight grounds as the authority of the Vulgate, of Pseudo-Jerome, and of Thomas Aquinas, they were bigots. But if they really thought

---

<sup>1</sup> See Vindex on the use of epitheta, *Gent. Mag.* for Jan. 1789, p. 12. I perceive, from the same Magazine for March 1789, p. 225, that he has not profited by the wholesome advice which I gave him. And how ungenerous it is, as well as cowardly, after swaggering and blustering, to sneak away from the combat, and leave Mr. Travis alone "to bear the burthen and heat of the day!" In the mean time I earnestly intreat Mr. Travis's admirers to refrain from boasting of their proselytes and repeating their defiance. Such quackery is unworthy any person who pretends to learning.

it genuine, their bigotry was so far honest. The same sort of bigotry predominated in your mind, when you quoted p. 286. the barbarous Greek of the Lateran council, and finding a chasm, supplied it by a still more barbarous translation of your own from the Latin. Thus would the Complutensian editors reason: "This verse is genuine, though it is not in the Greek copies. We will translate it therefore from the Latin Verity, and restore it to the context." But you, Sir, take for granted without proving (a vice very frequent in you, though you reprove others for it, p. 182.) that this verse was in all their Mss.; you hint Mr. Gibbon's wishes to be, that the editors had omitted it in opposition to all their authorities; and you profess an unwillingness (i. e. a willingness) to believe that Mr. Gibbon himself would in such a case have betrayed his trust. *Erugo vera!* Mr. Gibbon justifies the intention of the Complutensian editors, and only blames their prejudice. And who can deny their prejudice in favor of the Vulgate to have been excessive and absurd, after reading the following sentence from their preface to the Old Testament? "*Mediam Latinam beati Hieronymi translationem, velut inter synagogam et orientalem ecclesiam posuimus, tanquam duos hinc inde latrones, medium autem Jesum h. e. Romanam sive Latinam ecclesiam collocantes.*" Or who can wonder that men, so blindly devoted to a version, should sometimes presume to correct the originals from that version, especially in a passage, "*in quo maxime et fides catholica roboratur, et Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti una divinitatis substantia comprobatur?*" But in fact we have all the evidence necessary to prove that they actually paid this extravagant compliment to the Vulgate. For Stunica, who would have been extremely glad to have had the power of appealing to the Greek Mss. against Erasmus, quotes none in favor of this unfortunate verse, but rests the whole merits of the cause on the Latin copies, and the impostor who usurps the name of Jerome. You, Sir, to do you justice, think there is some force in this objection; and in a momentary fit of imprudence or modesty, p. 280. "own yourself unable satisfactorily to account for it." But these are the last struggles of expiring shame. For though you saw the unavoidable consequence of this concession, you add, that you have proved the Complutensian Greek not to be a translation from the Latin. Your tacit inference then is, I suppose, that it could only come from the Greek Mss. But this inference is a little too hasty. The Complutensian Greek may be a translation from the Latin, though not an exact translation. Let us suppose that Mr. Travis, while he was disputing against Mr. Gibbon, had the use of a Ms. which contained the suspected verse; would he neglect to produce its testimony in

---

<sup>2</sup> Pseudo-Hieronym. Prolog. in Epist. Canon.

defence of this very verse, and against a man whom he hated? If he believes this possible, or professes to believe it possible, I shall believe him either mad, "*aut illud quod dicere nolo.*" I ask therefore what could induce Stunica, who is at other times scarcely less virulent against Erasmus than Mr. Travis himself is, what could induce him to be so mild and tame in this particular instance? What but the consciousness that he knew of no Greek Ms. which contained the passage in question? Twells indeed has bethought himself of a salvo, and a precious salvo it is (Exam. P. ii. p. 142.) that the labor of collating the Catholic Epistles did not fall to Stunica's share. In the year when Stunica wrote his remarks on Erasmus, all his fellow-laborers were on the spot, able and willing, I hope, to inform him of the manuscript readings of this or of any other passage. For surely they had some discourse together on the difficult places, and did not perform each man his task in silence and solitude, without any consultation or communication. If Stunica had said nothing on this Epistle of John, we might not perhaps be able to extract any certain conclusion from his silence. But Stunica quotes his Rhodian Ms. frequently in opposition to Erasmus, once on the 16th verse of the third chapter of this Epistle, once on the 20th verse of this very fifth chapter, and both times in defence of the Complutensian reading. Yet on the 7th verse, where there was a pressing necessity, if ever necessity existed, of supporting his opinion by the authority of the Greek Mss. Stunica appeals to none. "*Where,*" cries Erasmus, "*sleeps this Rhodian Ms.?*" But the Codex Rhodiensis was as deaf to the reproaches of Erasmus, as Baal to the sarcasms of Elijah. No man in his senses would ever omit to urge evidence that was so much wanted, and that would have so much weight. Poor Stunica most piteously cries out, "*Sciendum est Græcorum codices esse corruptos; nostros vero ipsam veritatem continere.*" Now if this be not a full and clear confession, that he knew of no Ms. containing the disputed verse, I cannot tell what is. If the Codex Rhodiensis had been orthodox, he would have written to this effect: "*Quidam sane codices Græcorum hæc verba omittunt; Rhodiensis vero ipsam veritatem continet.*" I need not observe, that since this Ms. leans very much to the Vulgate, and particularly adds *et Gen* in the former of the two places above quoted, words found in no other Greek Ms. nor version whatsoever, its omission of the seventh verse of the fifth chapter will form a strong argument against the genuineness of the passage. Allowing then that the Codex Rhodiensis omitted, as it certainly did omit, this "excellent" passage, why did not Stunica consult others? Either he had no more to consult, or the other editors, and not Stunica, had collated them. If he had only the Codex Rhodiensis, why is he not ingenuous enough to confess it? If he or his brother editors had more, why did he not inform him-



self of their reading in this place, either from his own inspection or from those who had consulted them? They would naturally be anxious to confirm their own credit and veracity; they would be eager to tell him, if they could tell him with truth, that their *Mss.* gave the very reading which they had followed in their edition. When that edition was published, Erasmus's challenge had been made some time. While they were giving us a marginal note from Beatus Thomas, to account for their eighth verse, we should have esteemed it a favor if they had added a little postscript or preface, to inform us of the state of their *Mss.* in the foregoing part of the sentence. Nay, they ought to have done it; and as you say, Sir, p. 223. "Where it is a duty to speak, to be silent is to be criminal." To which I add, that where we should be sure to gain our cause by speaking, to be silent is to be foolish. "But if the Complutensian editors took not this verse from Greek *Mss.*, whence did they take it?" I answer, as others have answered, from the modern copies of the Vulgate, from the spurious Jerome and the Angelic Doctor: "this would be to charge those illustrious editors with forgery." I should be loth to call it by so harsh a name; "honest bigotry" better suits the purpose; but such is the everlasting sophistry which you and Martin employ. You aggravate the faults or negligences of the Complutensian editors, of Stephens and Beza, into crimes; and then, from the enormity of the offence argue against the probability of its being committed. Your reasoning may thus be reduced to the form of a syllogism.

Stunica, Stephens, Bera, &c. did not insert this verse in their editions contrary to the authority of their Greek *Mss.* unless they were impious hypocrites, abandoned cheats, notorious impostors, &c.

But they were not impious hypocrites, abandoned cheats, notorious impostors, &c. Ergo, they inserted this verse from the authority of their Greek *Mss.* —

Q. E. D.

—As I flatter myself that every unbiassed reader will see through and despise this paltry artifice, I shall give myself no farther trouble about it, but proceed to consider the objections that may be made to my position. You tell us, Sir, and truly too! that the Latin copies differ from the Complutensian. They do differ; but only in the seventh verse by reading (*hi tres unum sunt*) οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς instead of οἱ τρεῖς εἰς ἓν; which seems at first sight a considerable difference. You of course exult in it, and civilly ask, p. 184. "Can any man be so much a Beotian, as to imagine, that if these editors had meant to forge a Greek text, to follow the reading of the Latin copies, they would not have forged one which would have followed those copies exactly?" I confess, most learned Theban, that till I was enlightened by you, I was so much of a Beotian as to imagine, that if the intention of the Compluten-

sian editors was fraudulent, they might have wit or caution enough to make their translation vary from the Latin copies, the better to impose on the world by the apparent difference. They would disguise the child they had stolen, in order to conceal the theft. But I, who possess more charity than perhaps any other person in the world (always excepting you, Sir, and your humble admirers, Vindex, Eblanensis and Kuster<sup>1</sup>), will try to give a more candid representation of this matter. The Complutensian editors believed 1 John v. 7 to be genuine, and determined to insert it in their text. They also believed to be spurious, and determined to expunge the final clause of the eighth verse.<sup>2</sup> Thus then I suppose them to have translated the Latin into Greek; "*Οτι τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ πατήρ καὶ ὁ λόγος καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἐν εἰσι. Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα.*" In their Greek manuscript or manuscripts, they found, "*Οτι τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσι.*" What was now to be done? They were not willing entirely to abandon their originals; they accordingly patched up a motley text, and dexterously transplanted the clause *καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσι*, to the end of the seventh verse. So that as far as they could without damage to the orthodox faith, they followed the reading of the Greek manuscript. They thought this clause of too great size and importance to be turned out of doors without ceremony; they therefore suffered it to stay, though they provided it with rather an indifferent lodging. If Mr. Gibbon observed this, he had a fresh reason for attributing their conduct to honest bigotry. And it is no more than justice to allow that they at least did their work like workmen. They made good Greek of their Latin; a task to which the translator of the Lateran Decrees and the writer of the Dublin Ms were unequal. In my next I intend to travel through Stephens's, and the other manuscripts that have been said to contain this "excellent" verse.

I shall not quit this article without taking notice of an objection, which you, p. 185. and Martin Vailly, p. 171. seem rather to insinuate darkly, than to propose in form, "that the Complutensian reading of the seventh verse, *εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσι*, weakens the

<sup>1</sup> Gent. Mag. March 1787, p. 311.

<sup>2</sup> This clause is omitted in many of the Latin Mss. Mr. Travis, with his usual modesty, asserts, p. 238. that "the Latin copies have universally the concluding clause at the eighth verse." A direct falsehood! "*Usque adeo lectores suos pro mupis et hanc habet, quibus quidvis imponere sibi licet secum confidit.*" I appeal to the reader, whether a man who is capable of making such round assertions, wilfully or ignorantly, be not utterly disqualified to attempt a commentary, or to accuse others of misrepresentation.

evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity that might otherwise be drawn from this passage. Or that the words *eis τὸ ἐν εἶναι* may be understood of an unity of will and testimony; whereas the simple expression *ἐν εἶναι* must be understood of the unity of essence. Now, Sir, if I have rightly divined your meaning, be so good as to tell us whether we are to think the former reading genuine or not? If we accept it for genuine, and maintain, even from your own concessions, that the text is nothing to the purpose of the orthodox, all suspicion of fraud on the part of the heretics will be at an end, and you will be compelled to acquit the Arians of a scandalous accusation, which at present you have neither courage enough to avow, nor generosity enough to abandon, (p. 339—341.) But to me, I confess, the Complutensian *eis τὸ ἐν* appears full as orthodox as the more common *ἐν* alone; and may be thus paraphrased; *οἱ τρεῖς τὸ ἐν Θεῷ ἅμα συντελοῦσιν, hi tres conjuncti unum efficiunt Deum*; in the same manner as *ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν* is exactly synonymous with *ἀκέραι εἰσὶ δύο, ἀλλὰ σὰρξ μία*. Matt. xix. 5, 6. To show my uncommon civility, I advertise my reader, that I shall impartially transcribe every argument in your favor that has come to my knowledge; but I shall sometimes be content with transcribing them; for many are such as Patience herself would disdain to refute.

#### LETTER IV.

Of the Mss. used by R. Stephens and Beza.

What! will the line stretch out to 'he crack o' doom'?

Sir,

How formidable an host you are now leading to battle! Sixteen Mss. of Robert Stephens, all containing the heavenly witnesses! We may however spare our alarms; for all these Mss. on a nearer inspection will prove "phantoms bodiless and vain, empty visions of the brain." I shall first lay down the real state of the case, and then confute your cavils. Mr. Gibbon gives his readers the option between fraud and error. I am always unwilling to attribute to fraud what I can with any reasonable pretence attribute to error. But if any person be more suspicious than I am, he needs not be frightened from his opinion by your declamation. For when he considers how Erasmus was worried for speaking his mind too freely, and with what jealousy R. Stephens was watched by the Paris divines, it cannot appear incredible that Stephens might make this seeming mistake on purpose; so far, like Zaccagni (see Letter ii. p. 248.) honest in his fraud, that he furnishes every inquisitive reader with the means of detection. But as I am content with the object of my mission, I say, 1. That Henry Stephens, and not Robert, collated the Mss. 2. That the colla-

tion was probably inaccurate and imperfect. 3. That it certainly was not published intire. 4. That Stephens's margin is full of mistakes in the numbers and readings of the Mss. 5. That the marks in the text are often misplaced or omitted. 6. That some of the very Mss. used by Stephens having been again collated, are found to agree in this critical passage with all the rest that have been hitherto examined.\* And, 7. That therefore the semicircle, which now comes after the words *ἐν τῇ οὐρανῷ* in the seventh verse, ought to be placed after the words *ἐν τῇ γῇ* in the eighth.

You, Sir, answer in the first place, that H. Stephens was not the sole collator of the Mss. "because there is no pretence for the assertion, and because reason, propriety, and probability, are all uniformly against it," p. 297. Now this is so fully proved in Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 143—144. that I should even be tempted to hope that if you had read them before you wrote your letters, you would have spared yourself a considerable quantity of disgrace and repentance. I shall repeat Wetstein's last quotation: "*Pater meus—cum N. T. Græcum cum multis vetustis exemplaribus opera mea collatum, primo quidem minutionibus typis—mox autem grandibus characteribus,*" &c. To which add Beza's testimony to the same purpose: "*Ad hæc omnia-accessit exemplar ex Stephani nostri bibliotheca cum viginti quinque plus minus manuscriptis codicibus et omnibus pene impressis diligentissime collatum.*" Thus Beza in his first edition of 1556. But in his second edition, when R. Stephens was dead, these important words follow after "*impressis;*" "*ab Henrico Stephano ejus filio et paternæ sedulitatis hærede quam diligentissime collatum.*" Observe in all this proceeding the craft of a printer and editor. Robert was aware that, by telling his readers who was the collator, he might infuse a suspicion into their minds, that the work was negligently performed: he therefore carefully avoided<sup>1</sup> mentioning that circumstance. Another instance of this management may be seen in

---

<sup>1</sup> With the same caution, speaking of his No. 2; (now our Cambridge Ms.) he calls it, "*exemplar vetustissimum in Italia ab amicis collatum, ἀντιβληθὲν.*" Without fairly confessing or openly violating the truth, that it was collated by his son Henry, he disguises the fact in a general expression. I have not forgotten Mr. Travis's masterly construction of the sentence, p. 284; "*It was the exemplar, the book itself, then, (and not the lections out of it) which was collected or (rather) procured for R. Stephens, by his friends in Italy.*" I have heard of a learned Doctor in our university, who confounded the collection with the collation of Mss., but I never till now heard of a single copy being collected. That the reader may not suspect me of inventing nonsense for the pleasure of fathering it on Mr. Travis (a supposition which at first sight may seem not improbable), I assure him that I have honestly copied the very words, and can only beg of him to verify my citation by the evidence of his own senses.

the preface to his first edition, where he says, that he has not suffered a letter to be printed but what the greater part of the better Mss. like so many witnesses unanimously approved. This boast is indeed utterly false, as all critics agree, who have taken any pains in comparing Stephens's editions. They know that Stephens has not observed this rule constantly, because his editions often vary from one another, and his third edition often from all his Mss. even by his own confession. But because Mr. Griesbach took this point for granted; not foreseeing that a man would be found so hardy or ignorant as to deny it, you insult him, p. 298. and call his assertion "groundless, improbable, uncandid, and injurious." These are the magic words that have charmed your converts of the first eminence. Editors and printers are such conscientious people, that we may be sure they will never practise any tricks of their profession, or give their own publications undeserved praise. And whoever offers to think that they may sometimes bestow extravagant commendations on their own labor, diligence, or fidelity, is totally void of "literary candor and Christian charity," (p. 59. 125.) But an example will make this position clearer. In the eleventh verse of the second chapter of Matthew, all the Mss., the Complutensian edition, say the very Ms. from which Erasmus published his edition, have εἶδον instead of εἶπον; but Erasmus, on the single authority of a faulty copy of Theophylact, altered it to εἶπον: Stephens in his third edition followed Erasmus, and εἶπον infects our printed Testaments to this day. I can only excuse Stephens by the universal custom of dealers who think it an innocent deceit to cry up the value of their wares. Stephens inserted nothing in his text (mistakes excepted) which he did not find in the Complutensian edition, or in Erasmus, or in his Mss. But he frequently quits all his Mss. to follow his printed guides, and frequently follows Erasmus without attending to the rest, of which partiality I have already given a specimen. Let us be no more pestered with the stale common-places of honor, honesty, veracity, judgment, diligence, erudition, &c. If R. Stephens's Mss. all omitted the controverted passage, he would still retain it in his edition; because he has the same vicious complaisance for many other passages, without having equal seeming authority. Here he had the consent of both editions for his warrant; in other places he follows Erasmus alone. You, Sir, prove, with admirable conciseness, in something less than six pages, (p. 78—81. 172—177.) that Stephens did not take this verse from the Complutensian edition. Granted. He did not take it wholly from the Complutensian. He took it partly from the Complutensian and partly from Erasmus. He differs from Erasmus in adding the article *the*, and in transposing the word *day*; and in these four differences he followed the Complutensian edition and the genius of the language.

Mr. Griesbach asserts, as quoted by you, Sir, p. 297. that there are in R. Stephens's Mss. many good readings, which are not inserted in his margin. You answer him by a flat denial. This is indeed a compendious and convenient method of answering; but I would counsel you not to make it too cheap by frequent use. Mr. Griesbach thought that this and some other of his assertions were so generally allowed, that it would be waste of time and paper to prove them in form. At last up starts a grave and reverend gentleman, and tells us with a serious face, that it is not day at noon. And this trash we are expected to refute, or the Mampsimus regiment will boast hereafter that we have not accepted their leader's challenge. Let us, however, undertake the tiresome task of slaying the slain. First then I affirm, that Stephens has omitted to mark in his margin at least one-half of the Complutensian various readings. Have you a mind to dispute this, Sir? Will you give Mill the lie, as you have Sandius (p. 199.) and others? Now, if the collator was so negligent in noting the various readings of an edition, "which was printed from most ancient copies, and had a wonderful agreement with Stephens's own Mss." (Steph. Præf. ad N: T.) is it not extremely probable, nay, morally certain, that he was equally inattentive to his Mss.? I shall therefore assume, what seems to me sufficiently proved—that Stephens's collation was imperfectly published; which if you choose to deny, you must confute Wetstein also, who says that Beza produces from Stephens's Mss. above a hundred various readings not noticed in Stephens's margin. When Emlyn argued from Mill's authority, Prol. 1226. p. 126. that Stephens's collation was imperfect, and pressed Martin with this objection, that good old man told him, for want of a better answer, that Stephens had only neglected the trifling variations of the Complutensian edition, and selected the important. Not to insist, that by this method an editor claims the right of judging for the reader what is trifling and what important; the fact is notoriously false: for whoever will look into Stephens or Mr. Travis, p. 79. 172. will find, that of four differences from the Complutensian on this very place, Stephens mentions not fewer than—one. He mentions only his omission of *et rō* in the seventh verse, and is altogether silent on the addition of *ovros*; on the change of *ἐν τῇς γῆς* into *ἐν τῇ γῇ* in the eighth verse, and on the addition of the whole clause, *καὶ οἱ ῥεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰαυ.* After this flagrant instance of Stephens's inaccuracy, I expect to hear no more of his diligence and fidelity.

R. Stephens had fifteen Mss., seven of which—"Fifteen!" cries Martin in a rage; he had "sixteen." You, Sir, qui cum Martino errare malis, quam cum aliis recte sentire, sing to the same tune, p. 55. 116. and to prove it, quote from the preface to Stephens's third edition, "cum sedecim scriptis exemplaribus." You bright wits soar far above the reach of common sense, or else you might

have compared these words with the following: "his namque placuit, primo, secundo, ad sextum decimum usque nomina imponere, ut primo Complutensem editionem intelligas, quæ olim ad antiquissima exemplaria fuit excusa." This sentence to an ordinary reader would be very intelligible, but Mr. Travis is no ordinary reader. Can any thing be plainer than that Stephens calls the Complutensian edition a Ms. when he reckons his sixteen copies in the gross, because that edition had with him the weight and value of a Ms.? And if it was really printed, as Stephens believed, from most ancient manuscripts, he was reasonable and moderate enough in treating it as a separate Ms. But if besides No. 1, which signifies this edition, Stephens had sixteen Mss., his sixteenth Ms. would then be marked No. 17. Unluckily no such number appears in any part of the margin. However, as I love to be generous, I will help you to an argument, that will not only prove what you want, but something more. No. 19. (αθ) is quoted in the margin, Matth. xxiv. 20. from which deducting one for the Complutensian edition, there will remain eighteen Mss. belonging to Stephens, and *à fortiori*, sixteen. I know that foolish people who are called critics will start an objection. They will affect to think it, with Mill, a misprint for 12 (αθ. αβ.); but you, Sir, will wisely disregard what such fellows think. "Your soul never came into their secret, nor to their assembly has your honor been united." But what am I doing? Teaching the rudiments of arithmetic to a couple of "Clotens, who can't take two from twenty for their hearts, and leave eighteen!" (Cymbeline.)

Whether Stephens had sixteen or only fifteen Mss. in all, is not of so much consequence as the next question, how many of these contained the Catholic Epistles. Martin, (Verité, p. 171.) part of whose reasoning you have adopted, (p. 80. 175.) says, nine at least; and thus he argues: If Stephens had only seven Mss. in all, he would not have made a particular enumeration, but have said, π. or ἐν πᾶσιν in the margin. If he had only eight, he would have said, π. πλὴν (adding the number of the dissentient Ms.), such being his custom in other places. I answer, 1. That Stephens could not, consistently with truth, as Martin himself owns, use the mark π. in this place, because the Complutensian edition, his No. 1. dissents; nor, 2. could he, consistently with himself, say, π. πλὴν—, because he never does say so in his second volume, the Epistles and Apocalypse. But you are not content with Martin's scanty allowance, your lively imagination hurries you beyond the bounds of sober reason; and in one of your happy inventive moments you set down the whole sixteen, p. 284, as containing this dissenting passage. A jolly company! What luck old Robert had tonight on these Mss. and settle the true reading from them, ere Satan and his angels had laid their claws on them! Did you ever hear, Sir, of any large collection of Mss. all containing

the whole Greek Testament? Or, to deal liberally, let the Apocalypse be excepted, did you ever hear of so many as fifteen all containing the remainder? Take the trouble of consulting fifteen at hazard, you will be very fortunate if seven of them contain the Catholic Epistles. Or do you piously believe, that an editor who has not described his Mss. may have found only such as are complete, while scarce a sixth part of those Mss. which have been particularly described, contains the N. T. intire, even with the exception mentioned? You inform us, p. 275, (see also p. 295-6.) "that it does not follow from R. Stephens's not citing all his Mss. to all parts of his Greek Testament, that all his Mss. did not contain all the Greek Testament." But I can tell you what does follow. If R. Stephens's Mss. all contain the whole N. T., either the Mss. so rarely cited had a miraculous agreement with his text, such as never has been since found in any one Ms. or R. Stephens's collator was so infamously negligent, that his silence and his testimony are equally undeserving of regard. A ray of light however pierced through the Egyptian darkness of your mind, when you wrote the following sentence, p. 136: "The Ms. of R. Stephens marked 15 does not seem to have contained the Gospel of St. John at all; for there is no reference to this Ms. in the margin. But to what purpose do we prolong this childish play? Newton, Wetstein, and Mr. Griesbach, knew well enough that Stephens's No. 2 was once quoted on the Epistle to the Romans, No. 3 twice on the Apocalypse, No. 7 on the Acts, &c.; but they expected that an adversary, who had the least share of sense or candor, would not build any argument on the infallibility of a printer or compositor. They knew, too, that Stephens's margin was full of mistakes in the numbers of the Mss., and they judged it much more likely that  $\beta$  should be a mistake for some other letter (perhaps for  $\delta$ ), than that the same Ms. which in the Gospels and Acts was so prolific as to produce near four hundred various readings, should become so barren on a sudden as to yield only one in the Epistles. Whoever can bring his mind to believe this, possesses a faith that disdains all intercourse with reason; a faith that not only can remove, but has actually removed mountains. Nor would it be difficult to rectify many of these mistakes from the internal evidence of the margin. For instance, No. 5 ought to be 15 in both places of the Apocalypse; and, though it may seem strange, that the letters  $\alpha$  and  $\epsilon$  should ever be confounded, I can with certainty pronounce this to have happened in Acts xvii. 5. But let a single number be once quoted in Stephens's margin, you boldly set down as "beyond all contradiction," p. 295, containing that whole book of the N. T. where the marginal reference is found. In the first place, you take for granted that no Ms. of Stephens was mutilated. Secondly, though Stephens has given us as vague and unlearned an account of his Mss. as if he intended to keep us in the dark, we



are yet, with the few lights we have, often able to detect his mistakes. This argument therefore will do you no service, unless you can show that it was impossible for Stephens to err in his marginal numbers. I know such an accident is impossible in your creed; yet I have been told that it sometimes happens in printing; and perhaps you may find, that in your own enumeration of Stephens's Mss. p. 295. (where, by the way, you have been able to reckon up only fifteen) by the author's or printer's fault  $\epsilon$  is left for  $\delta$ . I shall therefore, Sir, "request your permission" (p. 16.) to believe that Stephens had only seven Mss. of the Catholic Epistles, and that if any of them omitted 1 John v. 7. they all omitted it. To which important discussion we now proceed.

Nearly two hundred and forty years are past since R. Stephens published his famous Greek edition of the N. T. with various readings. The marginal note on the contested place would undoubtedly say, if there be no error, that his seven Mss. all have the seventh verse, except the words  $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \upsilon\tilde{\nu}\alpha\rho\tilde{\omega}$ . But that seven Greek Mss. collected by the same person from different places—seven Mss. of different ages and merits—should all consent in a reading, that no critic or editor has been able, during the space of two centuries and a half, to find in any other Ms. whatever, Greek or Latin, is such an excess of improbability, as the very men who maintain here, would be foremost to ridicule in any other dispute. For let us suppose, by way of argument, that some other Greek Mss. retain the text, still these retain at the same time the words  $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \upsilon\tilde{\nu}\alpha\rho\tilde{\omega}$ . How comes it to pass, that none of these seven orthodox Mss. agrees with that noble pair the Dublin and Berlin, in rejecting the final clause of the eighth verse? And what makes the wonder of the thing is, that the seven Mss. which omit the words  $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \upsilon\tilde{\nu}\alpha\rho\tilde{\omega}$  should all fall into the same hands, perform the task imposed on them, and then vanish for ever. All these difficulties you obviate by answering, that the Mss. are lost. If such Mss. ever existed, they are certainly lost; but how do you prove that they ever existed? Because R. Stephens and T. Beza say that they existed. What says the former? He puts a mark in his margin that implies such an assertion. Surely this is not the eighteenth century, the age of criticism and learning, when such arguments as these are heard with patience, and thought to need a serious refutation. Does an editor, when he marks various readings in the margin of his edition, intend solemnly to pledge his word, to take an oath on the truth of every assertion which those marginal notes virtually contain? If such be the conditions of publishing ancient authors, the publishers are of all men the most miserable; and no man in his senses will undertake so painful and thankless an office. A critic who expresses his various readings without abbreviations, has a much better chance of avoiding mistakes; and yet mistakes occur very frequently, notwithstanding all

precautions. Thus Grotius, in his note on this passage, solemnly declares and positively affirms that our Alexandrian Ms. omits the final clause of the eighth verse. What would you, Sir, say on this, if you found it your interest to defend Grotius? Any thing rather than acquiesce in the true solution, that Grotius did not rightly understand or rightly copy the collation that was sent him from England. "That Grotius was a man of so much sense and veracity, that he could neither be deceived nor deceive; and that therefore the Alexandrian Ms. wanted this clause: that to suppose the contrary would be to accuse Grotius of telling a wilful lie; or that the Ms. which he quotes on this verse was not the Alexandrian," &c. This, Sir, I take to be the substance of what you would say in Grotius's defence; which would make a very handsome figure when it was trimmed in your gorgeous eloquence, and spread through two pages in a mixture of declamation and invective, in which it would be affected to teach us, that teaching Mr. Travis would be in vain, (p. 125, 126.)

But how could seven Mss. be lost at Paris? Many Mss. used by editors of that age are still preserved. Beza's two, the Clermont and Cambridge, are still extant, and in good condition. Most of the Mss. which Erasmus used are still extant, and in good condition. Were they in safer places or more likely to survive than Stephens's? What was Robert doing, not to restore to the King's library the eight Mss. that he had borrowed? Le Long's testimony would indeed save Stephens's honesty; but alas! at the same time it would demolish a main support of the verse. For Le Long says, that eight of the very Mss. that R. Stephens used (not fifteen, as you imagine, p. 128.) are now in the King's library, four of which omit the disputed passage. But you, Sir, are so offended with this testimony, that Le Long, Stephens, and the whole world, shall be liars, sooner than this charming text shall come to any harm. You therefore find a trifling error or two in Le Long's<sup>1</sup> account, make several more, and thence take occasion to set aside his whole evidence. But your chief argument is a tacit assumption, (which I have already considered,) that Stephens could not commit a typographical error. This however is so important an axiom, that you ought beforehand to be very sure of its truth. Again, Le Long says, that the eleven Mss. in the King's library have the insignia of K. Henry II. on the covers. Then, you exclaim, they are not the Mss. of Stephens; for his were borrowed of Francis, Henry's predecessor. The minor of this argument you

---

<sup>1</sup> Le Long is mistaken, 1. in making Stephens's No. 15 contain only seven Epistles of Paul, which contains also the Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse; and, 2. in making No. 16 contain two of the Gospels, which contains only the Apocalypse. See Mr. Travis's Appendix, p. 47, 48.

have omitted, but the same "thinking minds," that you have pressed into your opinion, p. 270, will be compelled, I doubt not, to acknowledge it for an eternal and self-evident truth, viz. that no king<sup>1</sup> ever sends his books to be new-bound. I told you, Sir, in my first letter, that you never read through Wetstein's Prolegomena. I now add, that you have not read through Wetstein's note on the very passage that you defend. For there you would have found these words (to which also Le Long refers, Emlyn, vol. ii. p. 274.) quoted from R. Stephens's answer to the Paris divines: "Postulant afferri, vetus exemplar—respondeo non posse fieri, quod non unum esset, sed quindecim relata in bibliothecam regiam, quæ mihi precario data fuerant." You say, "that it does not concord with the known probity of R. Stephens, that he, who had only borrowed eight Mss. from the royal library should return fifteen thither, for no other purpose, as it should seem, than to abuse the confidence of those friends, who had lent to him the other Mss. and to deprive them of their property." Who told you they were lent? "Quæ undique corrogare licuit." Does "corrogare" signify so strictly to borrow, that Stephens's friends could not have made him a present of these Mss.? The word *ἡθροίσαμεν* in the Greek preface intimates nothing about borrowing. But be that as it may, R. Stephens affirms two things, 1. That he once had fifteen Mss. (not sixteen); 2. That he now had them no longer, but had sent them to the King's library. There is indeed a small inaccuracy in this account, but of no consequence. Stephens probably spoke from memory. The manuscripts had long been returned; and it concerned not his examiners, who required him to produce them; to know the exact history of every Ms., its quondam possessor, &c. It was enough to tell them in general terms, that he was unable to comply with their demand, that the manuscripts were gone out of his hands; that they belonged to the royal library, and were now restored. Or he might perhaps, forget the precise words of his answer to the examiners, and only retain the substance. However, if you choose to take advantage of this slight mistake, and to give Stephens the lie, what will become of your pathetic declamation about worth and probity and honor? (p. 59. 125.) I cannot help observing how amiable this concern for Stephens's character is, and how well it sits on a man, who, though he is shocked at the idea of that learned printer cheating his friends, feels no scruple in making him cheat the king, and carry off the royal manuscripts to Geneva, as his own private property. From this confession of Stephens in the year 1552, four years before Beza's first<sup>2</sup> edition, that he

<sup>1</sup> Stephani u. Codex Reg. 2869. Compactus est iterum Henrico II. Galliarum Rege, Wetstein, Tom. ii. p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Beza first published his N. T. in 1556, though Mr. Travis erroneously, as his manner is, (p. 7. ed. 1 and 2.) makes it 1551. In his second

then had no Greek Mss. in his possession, it follows that Beza never had the use of any from Stephens, and that all your assertions and conjectures on that subject fall to the ground.

But why, Sir, do you attempt to confute Le. Long, and leave Wetstein untouched? Wetstein affirms, that he with his own eyes saw at Paris five of the seven Mss. that Stephens used in publishing the Catholic Epistles, (4, 5, 7, 9, 10,) and that these all omit from the words *ἐν τῷ ὀβρανῶ* to the words *ἐν τῇ γῇ*, inclusive. And I have such an opinion of Wetstein's sense and honesty (though he was an heretic), that I shall venture to think him in the right, till you, Sir, talk something more to the purpose. If you ask, how Wetstein came to know that they were the same manuscripts: I answer, by collating them, and finding them agree with Stephens's margin in other places. And lest you should reply, that the readings of these Mss. as given by Wetstein sometimes differ from the readings of Stephens's margin, "*cognosce ex me, quoniam hoc primum tempus discendi nactus es,*" that in these cases a general and remarkable similarity is a stronger argument for the affirmative, than a few variations for the negative. If we reject this canon, such a monstrous absurdity as this will ensue; that if a collator makes here and there a mistake, whoever afterwards consults the same manuscript, must not infer the identity of the manuscript from the perfect agreement of the rest of the collation. Thus the manuscripts will be daily multiplied, in the joint ratio of the number and negligence of the collators.

Having before shown that R. Stephens's work was in general inaccurate and imperfect, I proceed in the next place to point out some particular faults. In 1 Pet. iii. 11. the words *ἀγαθὸν ζητεῖσθω* are omitted, contrary to all manuscripts, versions, and former editions. Was this the effect of fraud or mistake? If we dare to suspect any fraud, you will remind us that "it will become us to consider how we can justify ourselves either in literary candor or Christian charity," &c. (p. 10. 13.) And we shall get very little by taking "the other [part of the] alternative," that Stephens omitted these words by mistake. For, by the help of the Travisian logic, which is of the sort that deduces quidlibet ex quolibet, I will prove that Stephens omitted them on the authority of manuscripts. Now he omitted them not by mistake; because he would in that case have replaced in his subsequent edition of 1551, a passage which he had left out of this edition by mere oversight. Not by mistake; because a man who had been so painfully accurate as to point out in his errata the misplacing of one comma, and the omission of another, cannot be supposed to have suffered two

---

edition he twice contradicts himself, and says 1556, pp. 130. 275. With no less exactness he makes (p. 111. 337.) Erasmus publish his Paraphrase in 1541, several years after his death.

such important words to have escaped his notice. Not by mistake; because the words in question are omitted in the edition of John Crispin. 1553, who was the friend and fellow-citizen of Robert Stephens, and must be concluded to have published with his assistance, for it is impossible to suppose, that Crispin would not, &c. Not by mistake; because the Latin version in the edition of 1551, which is placed by the side of the Greek, contains these words, and must consequently force them on the attention of Stephens, whose duty and interest would conspire to make him insert them in the original, unless he had (on good grounds doubtless) determined to reject them. If such labored nothings (which I have faithfully imitated from you, p. 57. 122. except that I have retrenched some of your redundancies) had any force, what would they prove? That a reading is supported by authority, which, as far as I can learn, every man hitherto has believed to be a mere error of the press. Yet this error passed at least four editions<sup>1</sup> without observation or correction. With respect to the marginal numbers and the marks in the text, errors abound in Stephens's edition. To set this matter in a clear light, I will give a collation of two pages of the Apocalypse, 176, 177. In these two pages Stephens's margin omits eighteen various readings of the Complutensian edition, and notes nineteen. Of these nineteen two are inaccurate and two palpably false. Three times the semicircle which ought to determine the quantity of text is omitted, and in a fourth passage it is at least once misplaced, for it is twice printed. Twenty-six<sup>2</sup> faults in the compass of two pages! In Apoc. xv. 2. καὶ is marked as wanting in two copies, whereas καὶ is extant in those copies, and the four following words ἐκ τοῦ χαράγματος αὐτοῦ are wanting. If then Stephens could, as I have proved, place both his obelus and semicircle wrong, I am surely very moderate, when I only contend for half of this mistake in a case of necessity. I am certain at least, that "the tremulous ball of orthodoxy must be almost invisible, if it vibrates within the narrow limits"<sup>3</sup> of this momentous semicircle. "But Stephens ought to have corrected this mistake, if it was a mistake, in his errata." Yes, to be sure he ought; so he ought to have corrected many others, some of which I have mentioned; but he has not done it, and therefore no particular reason obliged him to do it here. The transposition of a stop or a mistake in orthography, is easily rectified; but those errors, which are in truth of the greatest consequence, are at the same time most difficult to detect—a sophisticated text or a falsified margin. It was full as easy to

<sup>1</sup> Stephens, fol. 1550. 8vo. 1553. Crisp. 8vo. 1551. Francf. fol. 1601.

<sup>2</sup> Twenty-seven. See Postscript.

<sup>3</sup> Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 253. 4to, iii. 535. 8vo.

misplace a semicircle as a comma, for they are nearly of the same size and shape, and are frequently confounded in Stephens's edition; but if the semicircle were misplaced, it might elude all discovery, unless the editor either carried all the various readings in his memory, or would undertake the pleasing task of performing the whole collation anew. In short, when we consider that these seven manuscripts of Stephens on the one supposition give a reading which has never been found in any manuscript, Greek or Latin; that they destroy the antithesis between 'heaven' and 'earth,' which the context, if the verse were genuine, would plainly demand; that Stephens often misplaced his marks; that no manuscript can now be found in the library to which Stephens returned his manuscripts that exhibits this reading; while on the other hand, if we only suppose a single semicircle wrong placed, we shall have a text agreeing with all the other Greek manuscripts, or at least with more than one hundred; when we add to this, that Wetstein found at Paris five manuscripts, which agreed with five of Stephens's manuscripts in other places, but here contradicted his margin, none will hesitate to pronounce, that Stephens's copies followed the herd, and omitted the seventh verse, except only those who by a diligent perusal of Tertullian have adopted his maxims of reasoning, and measure the merits of their assent by the absurdity of the proposition to be believed.

I have already quoted the passage from Beza's preface or dedication, which proves that he had not the ocular inspection of Stephens's Mss. I have likewise proved that Stephens, by his own confession, had them no longer in his power in the year 1552. I might therefore safely dismiss the subject; but it may possibly divert the reader to see Mr. Travis's alacrity in blundering. You say, that Beza detects mistakes in R. Stephens's collation, whence you argue that Beza had the use of the same Mss. A most exquisite reason! Stephens, in printing the collation made by his son Henry, sometimes committed a mistake; Beza, by the help of Henry's autograph, corrected the mistake.<sup>2</sup> Is this so hard to conceive? It is also pleasant to observe, that Emlyn tries to prove a truth by a falsehood, and that you gravely follow him, p. 124. 275. For Beza detects no mistake in the passage to which Emlyn

<sup>1</sup> "Crucifixus est Dei filius; non pudet, quia pudendum est: et mortuus est Dei filius: prorsus credibile est, quia ineptum est; et sepultus resurrexit; certum est, quia impossibile est." Tertullian. de Carne Christi, 5.

<sup>2</sup> "Distinguendum inter collationem accuratam et editionem collationis accuratam: Cl. de Mastriacht accurate quidem contulit codicem Cæsareum; sed collationem non accurate edidit; quia plurima suppressit." Wetstein. Proleg. p. 160.

refers, but perfectly agrees with Stephens's margin.<sup>1</sup> But that the reader may see what stuff has imposed on some persons for irrefragable reasoning, I will transcribe a part of your note, p. 124. "It would have been well worth Mr. Emlyn's pains to have apprised us how Beza could possibly have detected a mistake of this kind, in Stephens's book of collations, unless by resorting to the manuscripts themselves." If this note did not proceed from the profoundest ignorance \* \* \* State it in English, and it will answer itself. How could Beza detect a mistake in Stephens's printed collations, but by resorting to the manuscript from which Stephens printed those collations? "Pudet quidem talibus immorari; sed quid facias? Ut adversarii sunt, ita morem geras, et infra te nonnunquam descendas necesse est." Again, Beza says in other places, "ego in omnibus nostris inveni. Sic legitur in omnibus, quæ quidem mihi inspicere licuit," &c. The former of these notes Beza had afterwards the modesty to withdraw. As for the other, and any expressions of the same sort, we must either soften them by a gentle interpretation, or be obliged to fix an imputation on Beza, which would ill suit his erudition, and still worse his piety. Beza too is sometimes very lax in his assertions. Matth. i. 11. he at first published from an interpolated manuscript of Stephens. In his later editions he restored the common reading; but that he might seem to have adopted the other on better grounds and authority than he really had, he goes on, "Robertus Stephanus ex vetustis codicibus excudit," &c. Now R. Stephens did never so print it in his text, but only puts it in his margin as the reading of one single manuscript. Such was Theodore Beza's good faith and exactness in sacred literature! Besides, any impartial reader will be convinced by the conduct of Beza himself with regard to this verse, that he had not the immediate use of Stephens's manuscripts. For having written in his first and second editions, "legimus et nos in nonnullis," he afterwards changed his tone, and in the succeeding impressions only says, "extat in nonnullis." How meek and modest! Such a sweet-tempered man as Beza, armed with the authority of so many manuscripts, would not have thundered his anathemas against the sesquihæretic<sup>2</sup> Erasmus for wresting the capital texts out of the hands of the faithful. Instead of charging the opposers of this verse with assisting the devil, he is so faint-hearted in his later editions, as to hint a doubt whether the

---

<sup>1</sup> "Neque extant in Complutensi editione neque in alio quodam vetusto codice ex nostris." Beza ad Apoc. i. 11. Emlyn understood it as if it were *extat in nonnullis*. *æ. n.* Steph. marg.

<sup>2</sup> *Novum Testamentum ab Erasmo versum. Ab Erasmo? Novum esse sesqui-hæreticum.*" Erasmus Colloq. Adolescentis et

seventh verse ought not to be expunged. If we may believe you, Sir, pp. 130, 275., R. Stephens himself expressly declares that he had lent Beza the manuscripts, which he (Stephens) formerly used. I wish you would pay a little attention to the truth of your facts, and not quote books without consulting them. Stephens is so far from affirming what you put into his mouth, that on an attentive perusal, he would appear to affirm the direct contrary. His words are, "*Quod ad exemplaria attinet—sunt autem cum alia tum ea omnia quæ in regis Gallorum bibliotheca extant,*" &c. If they were then in the French King's Library, how could Beza have them at Lausanne? If Stephens had kept them and lent them to Beza, he would have expressed himself in this manner: "*Quæ ex regis G. b. utenda habui*"—"Quæ ex regis G. b. mihi precario data sunt." Having at last discussed the subject of Stephens and Beza's orthodox manuscripts, I am compelled to decide (with sorrow I pronounce it!) that they have disappeared; perhaps they were too good for this world, and therefore are no longer visible on earth. However, I advise the true believers not to be dejected; for since all things lost from earth are treasured up in the lunar sphere, they may rest assured, that these valuable relics are safely deposited in a snug corner of the moon, fit company for Constantine's donation, Orlando's wits, and Mr. Travis's learning.

#### POSTSCRIPT.

Though I am almost ashamed to have wasted so many words on so plain and easy a subject as Stephens's manuscripts, I cannot forbear offering some farther observations. The beauty of Stephens's edition is such, that it dazzles the eyes of the ignorant beholder; and this circumstance, joined to the vulgar but erroneous persuasion that Stephens's editions are free from typographical errors, naturally creates a strong prejudice in favor of its correctness. But all the learned are agreed, that scarcely any critical benefit can be derived from it. For instead of giving an accurate and particular description of his manuscripts; what parts of the N. T. every one contained; where it was mutilated or defective; what was its probable age, &c.; he leaves us to gather information where we can find it. However, if he had scrupulously noted all the various readings in his margin, and attributed each to its proper parent, we might by a careful comparison of the external authority since produced, and the intrinsic goodness or badness of the readings, form a tolerable judgment on the antiquity and merits of his manuscripts. But instead of doing this, he has favored us with only a part of the various readings (probably less than half), and has frequently set down a reading as from one manuscript which belonged to another. Of thirteen hundred various readings of the Complutensian edition, he has omitted seven hundred; of four on the most curious place of the whole N. T. he



has omitted three. Since therefore he has been so negligent of a printed book, it is utterly unlikely that he should take more pains with his manuscripts, the majority of which were less easy to read. Again? in his folio edition, Stephens was so servilely addicted to Erasmus, (see Mill, Prol. p. 126.) that though he follows his manuscripts only in thirty-two places, and the Complutensian in thirty-one, he follows Erasmus's fifth edition in ninety-nine! Surely then an edition to which he pays much more deference than to any other single authority, might deserve a place in his margin, when he deserts it. To what motive shall we ascribe Stephens's obstinate silence? I am inclined to think, he was afraid of acknowledging himself indebted to an heretic for any assistance in sacred criticism. Thus much may serve for omissions. To the examples of error that I have produced in the body of my letter, I shall now add a few more. John xvi. 14. If Stephens's margin be correct, seven of his copies read λαμβάνει for λήψεται. Let Mr. Travis believe so if he likes; but every body else will quickly see that the marginal note belongs to λήψεται in the next verse. Acts ix. 31. a reading which manifestly belongs to one and the same manuscript is split into two, and the parts given to different copies. Two of the proofs that Martin and Mr. Travis bring against Le Long carry internal evidence against themselves from the very order of the numbers. Acts xxv. 14. α. α. η. xiii. 15. δ. α. On the first I have nothing to propose; the second ought, I believe, to be, δ. α. α. for these three manuscripts agree together in the same chapter once against all Stephens's other authorities, and once against all but the Complutensian. The same number is twice repeated in the margin of Apoc. xii. 2. α. α. α. (read α. α. α.) Nor is this edition free (however that silly fancy has gained credit) from the most glaring typographical errors. Thus pages 212 and 213 are numbered 213 and 214; and in the running-titles of pages 85 and 212, MATΘ. is printed for MAPK, and EYAPI. for ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ. Acts ix. 24. τὰ πύλας in the text; 1 Cor. xvi. 14. ἃ, γὰρ is violently rent asunder, as I have here represented it. I have counted above forty places where the semicircle is omitted; sometimes neither the obelus nor the semicircle appear; Rom. xvi. 24. Gal. iv. 14. Sometimes neither figure of reference nor semicircle; John xi. 30. Acts v. 33. vii. 57. Sometimes the text directs us to the margin for a various reading, where the margin is silent; Mark xiii. 19. Apoc. xvi. 1. Sometimes the semicircle is twice printed; 1 Cor. vii. 33. Apoc. ii. 7. Sometimes the figure of reference is misplaced; Rom. xiii. 3. Apoc. ii. 20. (correct my former collation, p. 29.) xxi. 6. xxii. 1. sometimes semicircle; Matth. v. 48. xi. 23. Acts vii. 21.

iv. 31. the semicircle is placed after the word λενθίρας, which is to follow αλ in the next verse, v. 1. The same mistake for which I contend in 1 John v. 7.

&c. sometimes both the figure and semicircle: Acts i. 26. Yet none of these mistakes are rectified in the errata, where Stephens has been "so painfully accurate," according to Mr. Travis, p. 58. 123. as to set commas and points exactly right. If then these plain and palpable faults, most of which are such as the smallest share of knowledge or attention would be sufficient to detect, if these could escape Stephens or his corrector, how much more easily might they miss the error of this reference, for the discovery of which a good memory, a strong judgment, or a painful attention was necessary?

But supposing that R. Stephens, or any other editor, had affirmed in express terms, that he possessed seven manuscripts of the Catholic Epistles, in which was read the verse, 1 John v. 7, except the words *ἐν τῷ ὁπαρῶ*, who would be bound to believe him? This ground is so smooth, easy, and pleasant, that the defenders of the said verse are perpetually pacing it over. After judiciously improving a marginal abbreviation into a solemn and formal asseveration, which must irrevocably decide the character of R. Stephens for honesty and veracity, they deafen us by bawling in our ears old scraps of sermons against the crying sin of uncharitableness. For my own part, I declare, that let any editor affirm, as positively as he will, that he has seven manuscripts of an ancient author, consenting in a certain reading; if a hundred manuscripts of the same author being afterwards collated are found all to agree in another reading, and to contradict the supposed seven manuscripts; whatever may be such an editor's general reputation for veracity, I shall certainly reject his testimony in this particular, either as a mistake, or (if his indiscreet friends will suffer no compromise) as a wilful and deliberate untruth. *Υενδομην ἄτορτος ἃ κεν περιβοιεν ἀκουήν*. In Horace, A. P. 65, "*palus*" has its second syllable made short, contrary to a known canon, and the constant usage of all good Latin poets. And to render the case quite desperate, Servius and Priscian expressly cite the verse for an example of this extraordinary licence. What says Theodore Marcilius to all this? He produces, if we may take his word for it, the true reading from ancient parchments of Horace and Priscian. On which Bentley observes, "*strenue frontem perfricare Theodorum Marcilium*," in plain English, that he is an impudent liar. And to Bentley's sentence of condemnation every person will subscribe, except Mr. Travis and his proselytes, whose "literary candor and Christian charity" will suffer them to think evil of none but heretics. "*Ego huic testi, etiam si jurato, qui tam manifesto fumos vendit, me non crediturum esse confirmo.*" (Mosheim in Horsley's Tracts, pp. 139. 355. 489.) But I have no objection to put the debate on a shorter issue. I will acknowledge the probability of Stephens's margin being right in this place, if another passage in the whole N. T. can be found, where even three of his manuscripts agree with each other, and differ from every copy since examined.

Twelve years before the appearance of Stephens's first edition, his father-in-law, Simon Colinæus, published the Greek Testament. Both Mill and Wetstein allow that he faithfully followed his manuscripts, and Wetstein candidly vindicates him from Mill's harsh censure of rashness and presumption, rightly observing, that Colinæus had few guides to follow, and that his poverty, not his will, was to blame. These manuscripts, however, whether good or bad, many or few, omitted 1 John v. 7; and consequently Colinæus leaves it out of his edition. If Colinæus borrowed his manuscripts from the royal library, they must have been some of those that were afterwards used by his son-in-law. If they were his own or lent him by his friends, still it is most probable that Stephens knew of them, and endeavored to procure them for the service of his own edition. But if any manuscript of Colinæus containing the Catholic Epistles was afterwards used by Stephens, since that manuscript certainly was destitute of the three heavenly witnesses, it will furnish a new proof, if proof be wanted, of the wrong position of the semicircle, in this memorable sentence of Stephens's edition.

The freedom with which I have treated "that great work" (as Mr. Travis calls it, p. 129.) may perhaps displease some of Stephens's idolaters; but the invidious praises that have been heaped on it by ignorant or interested persons, have extorted these unpalatable truths. The early editions<sup>1</sup> of the N. T. considered as the publications of critics, are for the most part worse executed than editions of profane authors, and owe their chief value either to their scarcity or splendor. But when I pass this censure, I find fault not with the men, but with the times. They did not then possess, nor if they had possessed, would they have known how to employ, the materials that have since been discovered.

Of Beza's edition it is needless to say more. As a critical work it has very little merit. Ignorant of the true use of various readings, he seldom mentions them but to support his own hypotheses; to which godly purpose he warps both text and interpretation. He makes his commentary (as indeed he partly boasts himself) a vehicle for abuse on Origen, Erasmus, and Castalio; especially the latter; against whom he indulges, "without restraint, the exquisite rancor of theological hatred."<sup>2</sup>

I have said that the words *in calo* are omitted in no Latin manuscript, though Martin, I know, tells us (*Verité*, p. 170.) that those words are marked in Hentenius's edition 1547, as wanting in five manuscripts. It seems to be the fate of this "marvellous text,"<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Griesbach's preface to the second volume of his N. T. pp.

<sup>2</sup> Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 384. 4to. iii. 377. 8vo.

<sup>3</sup> Martin.

to lead both friends and foes astray. For Simon himself, speaking of the edition of 1547, says, that it commits the same error as Stephens's Greek, and marks only the words *in celo* as wanting in five manuscripts, instead of marking the whole verse. Whether Martin was misled by Simon, or coined the error out of his own brain, I know not; but I know, that unless there are different copies of Hentenius's edition, which I hardly believe, Simon's assertion is totally false. For in the copy that I have seen, the whole seventh verse is comprehended between the obelus and the semicircle. Nor could it be otherwise. Hentenius's list of manuscripts includes the very Latin copies that Stephens had collated. Since, then, four of Stephens's manuscripts did certainly omit the whole seventh verse, it is no less certain that, whatever Hentenius's margin may seem to say, Hentenius himself meant to extend his marginal reference to the same quantity of text. Perhaps Simon confounded a republication of the book with the original edition. For the Antwerp edition of 1570 omits both obelus and semicircle; the Lyons edition, 1573, places this mark ], which answers to the semicircle in other editions, after the words *in celo*: the Antwerp edition, 1572, thus represents the text, *in celo*, and in the margin has this note '5. But these mistakes are set right in Lucas Brugensis's editions, Antw. 1574, 1583. Martin somewhere says, if I recollect, that Hentenius's edition, 1565, omits the words *in celo*, but I believe him mistaken. From these facts it seems to me a certain conclusion, that Robert Stephens might easily misplace his semicircle on this verse, when we see in two other editions the self-same error committed in the very same words. Still, if Mr. Travis wishes to catch at a twig that may save him from sinking, I will be charitable enough to direct him to R. Stephens's Latin edition of 1545, but I expect his thanks for the information. In that edition Robert has printed two versions, which he calls the Old and the New; the Old is the received Vulgate, the New is a translation from the Greek, made by Robert, or by some learned man under his inspection. The Old, as might be expected, retains 1 John v. 7; the New dismisses it from the text with ignominy, but puts a star after *testimonium dant*<sup>1</sup>, and adds in the margin, "Pater verbum et spiritus sanctus et hi tres unum sunt. Et tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra spiritus, &c. sic legunt quædam exemplaria Græca." Bengelius referring to this edition says; "Latina Stephani biblia luculam suo loco exhibent, et disertam in margine habent annotationem: Sic legunt (scil. *in celo* Pater, reliqua) quædam exemplaria Græca Britannicus NEMPE codex et Complutensis juxta Hieronymi lectionem." Nul-

<sup>1</sup> N. B. Bengelius's words are printed in the Italic character, as I have here represented them.

## 56 *On several Passages of Strabo, Plutarch, and*

lum alium habuit quem citaret." But De Missy (Journ. Brit. ix. p. 63.) taking Bengelius's explanation for Stephens's own words, bewildered himself in hunting for an edition that never existed. Now, if we put this marginal note to the torture, it will speak at last, and confess that some of its master's Greek manuscripts omitted the words *in calo*; for, on adding the text and the margin together, they will exactly make up two verses, bating those two words. If Mr. Travis be so cruel as to turn against me the point of the weapon with which I now present him, I must shield myself with Stephens's formal preference of the Greek copies that rejected the verse to those which retained it.

[To be continued.]

---

## *On several Passages of Strabo, Plutarch, and Athenæus, concerning the Works of Aristotle. By CH. A. BRANDIS, Professor at Bonn.*

ACCORDING to Strabo, xiii. p. 418, 19. ed. Casaub., Neleus the Skepsian came by hereditary descent into the possession of the library of Theophrastus, which contained as well the works of Aristotle as his own and those of some other writers, which Theophrastus, the first or one of the first collectors of books, (Strabo, i. 1.) had acquired. The descendants of Neleus, an ignorant set, hid the books of Theophrastus under ground, to secure them against the rapacity of the posterity of Attalus, to whom Skepsis belonged; and it was not till some time afterwards that they sold them to Apellico of Tejus, who, although he was rather a bibliomanist than a philosopher, and intent only on filling up the defects which insects and moisture had produced, was instrumental, by the number of copies he spread about, in giving a new impulse to philosophy, and especially to the peripatetic philosophy. For the peripatetics, not possessing any of the works of Aristotle or Theophrastus, except a few exoteric books, had from a want of philosophical matter contented themselves with giving rhetorical pinament to some general propositions; φιλοσοφεῖν πραγματικῶς—θέσει λεγούμεν. Cf. Schneider. in Arist. de Animal. Hist. i. tom. i. p. lxxviii.

Immediately after the death of Apellico, his library fell into the hands of Sulla, together with the town of Athens; and as Apellico had taken a part in the war against the Romans, it was brought to Rome, and the use of it allowed to the grammarian Tyranno. Recently written copies were sold by the booksellers, who did not take the trouble to compare them with the originals; as indeed

## *Athenæus, concerning the Works of Aristotle. 57*

was generally the case with books that were written for sale at Alexandria or at Rome.

Plutarch, in *vita Syllæ*, c. 26. p. 468. A. ed. Francof., relates, that but few of the books of Aristotle or Theophrastus were used by the old peripatetics, and those not accurately, because the property of Neleus had fallen into the hands of ignorant people. Sulla found them in the library of Apellico, and brought them to Rome, and the grammarian Tyrannio is supposed (*λέγεται*) to have arranged and completed them: for the words *ἐνοικεῦσθαι τὰ πολλὰ* cannot mean *intervertere*, as Xylander translates, nor *emendare*, as Solaus does: Thuc. *vā* 104. uses *ἐπισκευάζειν*, of ships repaired. Andronicus of Rhodes afterwards got the manuscripts, and published them, and wrote the catalogues, which became generally known.

Athenæus, v. p. 214. E., mentions, that Apellico had bought many works of peripatetic philosophers, and also the library of Aristotle, but he does not say from whom.

And finally, Diogenes Laertius, v. 52., reports, that Theophrastus left all his books to Neleus as a legacy.

The authenticity of this report is warranted by Strabo, as he was intimately acquainted with Tyrannio, and Boethus the pupil of Andronicus; since the former had been his master, and the latter, Boethus, his fellow-student, with whom he had studied the philosophy of Aristotle. Cicero also, and Quintilian, speak of the successors of Theophrastus, and allow them to have excelled as rhetoricians, although they do not seem to think much of them as philosophers: (cf. Cic. de Fin. B. et M. V. 5. Tuscul. Q. ii. 3. Quintil. Instit. xii. 2.) the difference of the esoteric and exoteric works of Aristotle is often mentioned from the time of Cicero; and in addition to all this it is a well-known fact, that it was only from the time when the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus are mentioned to have been recovered, that frequent references to them were made; then only were learned interpretations begun: for it can be proved, that the old interpreters (*παλαιοὶ ἐξηγηταὶ*) did not live before the time of Andronicus, except perhaps Sotion and Aristo; and it remains doubtful, whether the latter was Aristo Julius, who presided over the peripatetic school about Olymp. clix. What Plutarch says of Andronicus is confirmed in several ways, although we cannot prove that he followed Strabo, as Schneider conjectures.

It is to be regretted, that both express themselves in so vague a manner. According to Strabo, the elder peripatetics made use of a few, especially the exoteric works of Aristotle and Theophrastus; and Plutarch says, that even these few were not used accurately. The vague assertion of the former, and the timid expression of the latter, who does not distinguish between exoteric and esoteric works, although he must have known the difference, demand a careful examination; and this is justified also by the circumstance,

## 58 *On some Passages in Strabo, Plutarch, and*

that the most diligent commentators of Aristotle say nothing about the fate of his works. Several of them made use of the Commentaries of Andronicus, and of his Paraphrases to the Categories and the Physics of Aristotle, and of his books and of those of Adrastus on the works of Aristotle, and their order:<sup>1</sup> but if they knew on such authorities, what had been the fate of the greater and more important part of the works of Aristotle, then it would have been the most unpardonable negligence on the part of Simplicius and Ammonius (not to mention Alexander, and Johannes Philoponus, who commented only on single divisions of the works of Aristotle), to pass over such an important circumstance in their copious preparatory comments to the Categories; and Simplicius particularly would be highly blameable, who speaks of the division and the arrangement of the books of Aristotle; and even the excellent Porphyrius would not be free from such a reproach, whose copious commentary to the Categories was frequently made use of by Simplicius.

According to Plutarch, Andronicus received copies of the books of Aristotle from Tyrannio: but he cannot have had access to the originals, which must have been in the library of Apellico; for he would have referred to them, when he doubted the genuineness of the book of the Interpretation, and of the last part of the Categories; and Alexander, Ammonius and Simplicius would have preserved us what was said about it, together with the conclusion drawn from its contents; and the various readings which he offered would have had a greater weight with the latter commentators. Cf. Ammonius and Alexand. II. 2. Simplic. in Categ. quat. σ. p. 14; and Simpl. I. 1. β. p. 1. 4. cf. Dexipp. Boethius, the pupil of Andronicus, had already endeavoured to correct the text, (Simpl. I. 1. γ. p. 8, 9.) and at least Adrastus, probably also several before him, had mentioned that some books of Aristotle were found in double copies, widely differing from each other, particularly the Categories, and the seventh book of the Physica. (Simpl. I. 1. α. p. 14. cf. Ammon. in Categ. f. 6, Simpl. in Physica, f. 242.) No critic of any consequence would have neglected to

---

<sup>1</sup> We owe the most important information on Andronicus to Porphyrius (in Vita Plotini γ. p. 3. ed. Basil.) ο Ἀνδρῶνικος Ἀριστοτέλους καὶ Θεωράστου βιβλία αἱ πραγματικαὶ διὰ τε, τὰς ἀκριβὲς ἀποδείξεις ἐς τὰς αὐτῶν συναγωγὰς. From the Commentary of Andronicus to the Categories, quotations are found in Ammonius, Dexippus, David (inedited), and more frequently in Simplicius, e. g. f. 216. From him may be borrowed, what Ammonius (in Aristot. i. de Interpret., Venet. 8vo. t. 6. l. 7. n.) and Alexander (in Aristot. Analyt. Priora, f. 52.) allege. Even the Life of Aristotle, supposed to be written by Ammonius, refers to it in the old Latin translation. The books of Adrastus, ἐπὶ τῇ εἰρήνῃ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους συγγραμμάτων, are mentioned by Simplicius, Philoponus, David, in another inedited Commentary to the Categories, and are quoted by Galenus.

## *Athenæus, concerning the Works of Aristotle. 59*

avail himself of the originals from the library of Apellico; and if they had collated the originals, they would not have omitted to communicate to us the result of the collation, whenever they had any doubt about the text.

It is therefore to be assumed, that neither in the Commentaries of Andronicus, nor in those of his successors, nor generally in their writings on the books of Aristotle, any account was found which agreed with that of Strabo and Plutarch; nor could it be inferred that they had made any use whatever of manuscripts which could be considered as originals of Aristotle, or equal to them.

The manuscripts, it is reported, were spoiled by insects and humidity, and badly restored, first by Apellico, and afterwards by Roman copyists: it is natural, therefore, to expect that the books of Aristotle must have great defects, and that the text must be spoiled, and that evident proofs of improper emendations must be found; the more as it must appear, from what we have stated, highly improbable that Andronicus could have restored the text with the aid of the original. Now it is true, the text of Aristotle has not been preserved as free from corruption as that of Plato; but at all events such defects, emendations, and supplements, as they would contain, if Strabo could be entirely depended on, cannot be found in the greater and more important part of the work of Aristotle, and perhaps only in the fragments on Xenophanes, Gorgias, and Melissus, and some perhaps also in the *Politics*, which before the death of Theophrastus must have been spread pretty widely in numerous copies. The difficulties of the metaphysical books cannot be imputed to the disastrous fate of the originals. Besides, it is said that Aristotle sent his metaphysical books to Eudemus, who did not think it proper to publish them: but after his death the Peripatetics (*οἱ μετὰ τὸν ἀριστοτέλην*) endeavoured to supply the defects from other books of Aristotle. This tradition is found in the inedited Commentary of Asclepius on the *Metaphysics*: and although this commentator is of little value, and deserves but little credit, still he might have borrowed this notice from older commentaries, perhaps from that of Alexander, to whom he owes every thing, without ever mentioning his name.

The report of Strabo applies perhaps only to a part of the little books of Theophrastus. But let us examine what credit we are to give to the report, that the successors of Theophrastus were only in possession of a few, and those chiefly the exoteric works of the two great masters of the Peripatetics.

No doubt the Peripatetics of later times had degenerated, and were in profound ignorance of the spirit of the Aristotelic philosophy. But Strabo, the natural philosopher, although he abandoned the metaphysical principle of Aristotle, still deserves our regard; and he had many opportunities of referring to the works of Aristotle, especially in his books on the principles, on the causes, on the



## 60 *On some Passages of Strabo, Plutarch, and*

time, on the accidental, on the relations, on the definition, (Diog. Laert. v. 59.) and similar subjects of logic, physics, and metaphysics; and he has not neglected the opportunity of doing so, as we may infer from the scanty quotations from his work, ἐν τῇ περὶ προτέρου καὶ ὑστέρου μονοβιβλίου. (Simpl. in Categ. v. p. 12.) And Demetrius Phalereus would not have enjoyed such high reputation among the ancients, had he not, before he went to Alexandria, endeavoured to take copies of the works of Aristotle, if they were not already very frequent at that time. Nor would even men of latter times have disgraced themselves by such utter neglect of the writings of Aristotle.

Can it be supposed that the principal part of them was out of their reach, because there existed a single copy in the library of Theophrastus, transferred to Skepsis?—that Strabo, during the life-time of Theophrastus, had only the use of them for a short time, and on condition not to take any copies of them? Such a conduct would reflect but little credit on Theophrastus, and would be altogether absurd, if he was not the sole possessor of the books of Aristotle.

Now Eudemus of Rhodes, and Phantias, had written works which, in substance, embraced what was contained in those of Aristotle, which bore the same title; and Eudemus had carefully availed himself of Aristotle. But if he possessed some works of Aristotle, would he not have communicated them to others? Or would he have borrowed them for a short time from Theophrastus? But some valuable traditions say, that Eudemus applied to Theophrastus on account of corrupted copies of the fifth book of the *Physica*,<sup>1</sup> and that Aristotle sent to Eudemus his books on Metaphysics. Theophrastus was not even the sole possessor of the letters of Aristotle; but they had been collected by Artemon before the time of the book of which Demetrius is supposed to be the author, and published with a preface. And was not the school of Aristotle called upon to propagate the writings of their master, on which they grounded their most important doctrines?

But during the long time that, according to Strabo and Plutarch, the writings of Aristotle were in a state of decay, the more important part of them were known even to people who did not belong to that school. The Stoic Chrysippus died in the 143d Olymp., consequently about twenty Olympiads after Theo-

---

<sup>1</sup> Simpl. in Phys. Auscult. f. 916. ἡρῆσαι δὲ καὶ πρότερον ὅτι καὶ μετὰ πέντε βιβλία τὰ πρὸ τούτου (τοῦ ἔκτου) φυσικὰ καλοῦσι, τὰ δ' ἑγχεῖσθαι τρία περὶ κινήσεως οὕτω γὰρ καὶ Ἀνδρόνικος ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ βιβλίῳ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ κινήσεως διατάττειται, μαρτυροῦντος περὶ τῶν πρώτων καὶ Θεοφράστου, γράφοντος ἑαδῆμου περὶ τινος ἀδελφοῦ τῶν δι' μαθημάτων ἀντιγράφων κατὰ τὰ πλείονα βιβλία, κ. τ. λ. Two Paris Mss. read γράφοντος ἑαδῆμου π. τ. αὐτοῦ κ. δ. It is evident that Eudemus was in possession of an important work of Aristotle.

phrastus made undoubted use of them. He had quoted Aristotle in his books on the Dialectics; and mentioned Plato, Polemon, and Strato, (Plutarch. de Stoicis Repugn. p. 1045 F. cf. Baguet de Chrysippi Vita, Doctrina et Reliquiis, p. 148.) and in his treatises on the definition had noticed the Aristotelic definitions, when he for instance asserted: *ὅρος ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀπόδοσις*, (Baguet, p. 234.) and had probably referred to Theophrastus and Eudemus in his doctrine of the hypotheticalal conclusion, and drawn on Aristotle in his book on privation and negation: (*ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν στερητικῶν*, Simpl. in Categ. τ. p. 10. cf. p. 6. 11. 13. v. p. 1.) The Stoics, and among others Chrysippus, took their doctrine *περὶ τῶν ἐναντίων* from Aristotle, (Simpl. in Categ. τ. p. 6.) *τῶν γὰρ Στωϊκῶν μεγαλοφρονούντων ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν λογικῶν ἐξεργασίᾳ ἐν τε τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐναντίων, σπουδάζουσι δεικνύναι (οἱ κλεινότεροι τῶν ἐξηγητῶν) ὅτι πάντων τῆς ἀφορίας ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης παρέσχεεν ἐν ἐνὶ βιβλίῳ ὃ περὶ ἀντικειμένων ἐπέγραψε κ. τ. λ.)* and had regard to Aristotle in their treatises on the Categories. Thus also, when Chrysippus says of time, that it is the distance of motion, and the measure of velocity and slowness, ad infinitum divisible, we perceive clearly that he wanted, by slight alterations, to appropriate to himself the definitions of Aristotle. (Baguet, p. 170 F. and 181, cf. Simpl. in Categ. p. p. 8. cf. Aristot. Auscult. Phys. iv. 10 F. especially iv. 14. in.) The proposition also, that motion is limited to change of place, or local changes, and changes of form, which was set forth by Chrysippus according to Stobæus, (Stob. Eclog. Phys. i. p. 404. ed. Heer. cf. Aristot. I. i. v. 2.) reminds us of Aristotle: thus also the doctrine of the Stoics on space, and its separation from the vacuum, (Baguet, p. 180. cf. Aristot. I. i. iii. 5. p. 54. iv. 4 F.) much more yet their reducing the elements to the linear motions, in opposition to each other, by means of lightness and heaviness. (Baguet, p. 179 F. cf. Aristot. de Cælo iii. 3. F., de Generat. et Corrupt. ii. 2. F. Only in the doctrine about the sky, Chrysippus deviates from Aristotle.) In the disputations between Chrysippus and Diodor. Kronus, *περὶ δυνατῶν*, the metaphysical definitions of Aristotle have not been overlooked. Finally, Chrysippus refutes the ethic doctrine of Aristotle, as we know from Plutarch de Stoicis Repugn. p. 1040 E. (Baguet, p. 276.) whence we may infer, that he possessed works of Aristotle which are lost to us.

It would be of great interest to know how far the Alexandrian writers availed themselves of Aristotle. Several, among others Hermippus, probably at the time of Ptolomæus Epiphanes, wrote long treatises on Aristotle: he must also have fully entered on the works of Theophrastus, since his opinions about the history of the planes and on the metaphysical fragment are quoted. Probably also Diogenes Laertius and Anonymus took their catalogue of Aristotelic books, since it differs so much from what we know of

## 62 *On some Passages in Strabo, Plutarch, &c.*

the arrangement of Andronicus, from Alexandrian writers, whom Diogenes Laertius, in his life of Aristotle, evidently had lying before him. We should soon get out of the dark, if we could but follow up the notice which is given to us in an old translation of the life of Aristotle by Ammonius: "demittens testamentum scriptum, quod fertur ab Andronico et Ptolomæo cum voluminibus suorum tractatum." David, in the inedited commentary to the Categories, styles this Ptolomæus, who is supposed to have written also on the books of Aristotle, besides Andronicus; (King) Ptolomæus Philadelphus: τῶν Ἀριστοτελικῶν συγγραμμάτων πολλῶν ὄντων χιλίων τὸν ἀριθμὸν, ὡς φησι Πτολεμαῖος ὁ φιλάделφος, ἀναγραφὴν αὐτῶν ποιησάμενος καὶ τὸν βίον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν διαθεσιν, κ. τ. λ.

We know for certain that the works of Aristotle were contained in the library at Alexandria: for Athenæus relates, that Ptolomæus Philadelphus bought all the books of Aristotle from Neleus; and it is mentioned besides, that the great library at Alexandria was in possession of forty books of the *Analytics*, and of two books of the *Categories*; and that the high prices which were given for the books of Aristotle by the Ptolomæans, induced many to sell spurious books. (Ammon. in *Cat.* p. 100.) Apellico may have had the copies, and Ptolomæus the original; or Neleus may have possessed at first double originals; or the two buyers may have bought each only a part of the Aristotelic originals, and Athenæus not clearly expressed himself (for there is apparent contradiction between the two notices given by Strabo and Athenæus): however the case may stand, it seems too arbitrary to reject the notice of Athenæus altogether, as Schneider does: the more as there are various ways to solve the difficulties.

It is clear from what we have said, 1. That Tyrtamion and Andronicus of Rhodes cannot have had any originals of Aristotle. 2. That Andronicus and his next successors knew nothing of the pretended adventures of the Aristotelic books. 3. We are convinced, that if not all, at least the greater number and the most important of them were in the hands of Strabo and Chrysippus, and known at Alexandria. 4. It is false, that Theophrastus was the sole possessor of the more important part of the works of Aristotle.

Nevertheless, we do not accuse Strabo and Plutarch of voluntary falsehoods, but only charge them with having drawn wrong conclusions from the facts which they relate. Neleus was known to be heir of the library of Theophrastus, which had contained the greater part of the works of Aristotle: it was a fact, that Sulla had brought to Rome an important collection of works of Aristotle and Theophrastus, which had belonged to the library of Apellico; it was known also, that they had been bought at Skepsis from the heirs of Neleus: but the inference they drew, that from the death of Theophrastus down to the time of Apellico, these

treasures of the Peripatetic school had lain hidden from the world, is false, and probably to be put to the account of their authorities. They were led to this conclusion by the circumstance, that in the library of Apellico, which was brought to Rome by Sulla, some books of Aristotle were found, of which until then no other copies had existed. The state of irremediable corruption, in which some of the smaller works of Theophrastus especially are found, renders this very probable. The originals, by which the *latter* have been preserved to us, may have been destroyed by insects and humidity, or copied negligently; but this applies only to them, and not to the greater, and more important part of the Aristotelic writings. It is possible also, that some of the *ὑπομνηματικά*, which pass under the name of Aristotle, were found exclusively in the library of Neleus, and had given rise to that sweeping notice.

## NUGÆ.

No. XX.—[Continued from No. LXXII.]

Supplement to the Notes on the Latin Poets.

### I. AUSONIUS.

l. vii. In comitatu verus tibi fui. 'This use of *verus* in the sense of *fidus*, is remarkable, from its coincidence with our own idiom. Indeed, we ourselves recognize it in a contemporary writer of Latin, as an English *Classical Journal*, No. LII. p. 232.) Other coincidences might be specified between the later Latin and the English. Claudian, *Epist. Æ. 21*, Ipsam præterea dominam telluris Olympi Ad nati thalamos ausa rogare parent: literally, to ask her to her son's wedding. *Id. in Ruf. ii. 154*, regit Italiam, Libyamque cœcileet; Hispanis Gallisque jubet: where *abice*, like the English verb *to command*, is invested with a causative, in addition to its neuter signification.

II. *Perioch. iii. Iliad. init.* Argivos sua quemque acies in bella sequuntur. Dispositi in turmas equitum, cuneosque pedestres, Turbida clangentes confundunt agmina Troes. We would alter the punctuation of these verses, as follows: Argivi—sequuntur, Dispositi—pedestres. Turbida—Troes. The words of the original are: Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κόσμηθεν ἄμ' ἡγεμόνεσσιν

ἕκαστοι, Τρῶες μὲν κλαγγῇ τ' ἐνοπῇ τ' ἴσαν, ὄρνιθες ὥς.—Οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἴσαν σιγῇ μένεια πνεύοντες Ἀχαιοί, Ἐν θυμῷ μεμαῶτες ἀλέξμεν ἀλλήλοισιν. Here there is nothing corresponding to the second verse in Ausonius, nothing, therefore, which determines the application of that verse. Taken, however, as relating to the Greeks, the words “*Dispositi in turmas*,” &c. harmonize perfectly well with the first line, and form an appropriate antithesis to the third; whereas, if understood of the Trojans, they appear to be contradicted by the verse immediately following.

III. Perioch. iv. Iliad. Minerva—*Paſſidarum sagittandi peritum astu suadentis aggreditur, ut clam vulnerato Menelao belli causa crudescat.* The expression *astu suadentis* in this passage is parallel to that in Epitaph. Her. xiii. 3. of which we, in a former part of this paper, expressed some suspicion: *Non habeo tumulum, nisi quem mihi voce vocantis Et pius Æneas, et Maro composuit.*

## II. CLAUDIAN.

IV. In Prob. et Olyb. Cons. ii. His neque per dubium pendet Fortuna favorem, Nec novit mutare vices: sed fixus in omnes Cognatos procedit honos. We doubt the propriety of this punctuation, inasmuch as “*Nec novit*,” &c. appears to us to relate more naturally to *honos* than to *Fortuna*. We would therefore read, to the improvement of the sense as well as of the expression, *His neque per dubium pendet Fortuna favorem: Nec novit mutare vices, sed fixus in omnes Cognatos procedit honos.* We subjoin a few other instances, in which the punctuation of Claudian appears to us capable of improvement. I. In Eutrop. i. 500. *Quid trahor ulterius? Stilicho, quid vincere differs, Dum certare pudet?* Read: *Quid trahor ulterius, Stilicho? quid vincere differs, &c.*—II. Ib. ii. Præf. 23. *Sic juvenis, nutante fide, veterique reducta Pellice, defletam linquit amica domum.* Rather: *Sic, juvenis nutante fide, &c.*—III. De Laudib. Stilich. i. 69. *Nubilis interea maturæ virginis ætas Urgebat patrias, suspensio principe, curas; Quem simul imperioque ducem, natæque maritum Prospiceret, dubius toto quærebat ab axe Dignum conjugio generum, thalamisque Serenæ.* We would point these lines as follows: *Nubilis—curas, Quem—Prospiceret. Dubius &c.;* a construction familiar to Virgil: *Æn. iii. 143. Rursum ad oraculum Ortygiæ Phœbumque remens Horatulus, precor ire mari, veniamque precari: Quam fessis finem robora ferat; unde laborum Tentare auxilium jubeat; quod ver-*

tere cursus. VI. Multa inter sese vario sermone serebant : Quem socium exanimem vates, quod corpus humandum Diceret. IX. 226. Ductores Teucrum primi, delecta juvenus, Consilium summis regni de rebus habebant, Quid facerent, quisve Æneæ jam nuntius esset. Compare Cons. Hon. vi. 148. De Raptu Proserp. iii. 6.—IV. De Raptu Proserp. i. 122. Hæmæ Cæceri pioles optata vigeat Unica ; nec tribuit sobolem Lucina secundam, Fessaque post primos hæserunt viscera partus, Infœcunda quidem ; sed cunctis altior exstat Matribus, et numeri dampnum Proserpina pensat. Perhaps : Fessaque—partus. Infœcunda quidem, sed cunctis altior exstat Matribus —. The construction is thus rendered more elegant ; besides that the line “ Fessaque,” &c. appears as if made for the winding-up of a Claudianic period.—V. Ib. 277. Torvos invisa jugales Aleto temone ligat, qui pascua mandunt Cocyti, spatiisque Erebi nigrantibus errant, Stagnaue tranquillæ potantes marcida Lethes Ægra soporatis spumant oblivis linguis. Orphnæus crudele micans, Æthonque sagitta Ocior, et Stygii sublimis gloria Nycteus Armenti, Ditisque nota signatus Alastor, Stabant ante fores juncti, sævumque fremebant, Crastina venturæ spectantes gaudia prædæ. Read : Torvos—linguis : Orphnæus—Alastor. Stabant—. The catalogue of names occurs in its natural place at the end of the definition or description : as lib. ii. 55. comitantur euntem Naides, et socia stipant utrinque corona, Quæ fontes, Crinise, tuos, et saxa rotantem Pantagiam, nomenque Gelan qui præbuit urbi, Concelebrant, &c. De Cons. Mall. Theod. 84. Virg. Æn. vii. 723, 793, &c. &c. Of the other arrangement few, if any, examples are to be found in the Latin poets.—VI. Epist. ii. 1. Orphea cum primæ sociarent lumina tædæ,—Certavere feræ picturatæque volucres, Dona suo vati quæ potiora darent. Quippe autri memores, cautes ubi sæpe sonoræ Præbuerunt dulci mira theatra lyræ, Caucaseo crystallæ scrunt de vertice lynces, &c. Read : Certavere—darent : Quippe—lyræ. Caucaseo, &c.

V. Ib. 53. quantas per Lydia culta Despumat rutilas dives Pactolus arenas. Heinsius, apparently to avoid the awkwardness of *quantas—rutilas*, proposes *quantum—rutilæ—arenæ*. An easier alteration would be *quantus* for *quantas*.

VI. In Rufin. i. 47. Quo nova corrumpit nostros clementia mores ? Quo rabies innata perit ? “ *Quæ nova vulg. corripuit*, al.” Gesner, Var. Lectt. We shall consult at once elegance of style and uniformity of construction, by reading : *Quæ nova corrumpit* nostros clementia mores ?

VII. De Nupt. Hon. et Mar. 92. In medio glebis redolentibus area dives Præbet odoratas inesses : hic initis anomi, Hic casia matura seges : Panchaia turgent Cinuama, nec sicca frondescunt vimina costo, Tardaque sudanti prorepunt balsama ligno. Milton's Paradise Lost, v. 291.

Their glitt'ring tents he pass'd, and now is come  
Into the blissful field, through groves of myrrh,  
And flow'ring odors, cassia, nard, and balm,  
A wilderness of sweets.

VIII. In Eutrop. ii. 229. Sic fata, repente In diram se vertit avem, rostroque recurvo Turpis, et infernis tenebris obscurior alas Auspicium veteri sedit ferale sepulcro. Read, with most of the Mss., *infernas*.

IX. Ib. 347. Dulcior hic sane cunctis, prudensque movendi Juris, et admoto qui temperet omnia fumo Perivodus; accensam sed qui bene derouat iram. Aristoph. Eq. 211. ΑΛΙΑΝΤΟ-ΠΩΛΗΣ. Τὰ μὲν λόγῳ αἰκάλλει με· θαυμάζω δ' ὅπως τὸν δῆμον οἷός τ' εἶμ' ἐπιτροπεύειν ἐγώ. ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΗΣ. Φαυλότατον ἔργον· ταῦθ' ἅπερ ποιεῖς, ποιεῖ· Τάραττε, καὶ χόρδευ' ἐμοῦ τὰ πράγματα Ἀπαντα, καὶ τὸν δῆμον αἰεὶ προσποιεῖς, ἵπογλυκαίων ῥηματίοις μαγειρικοῖς.

X. De Laudib. Stilich. i. 328. Neglectum Stilichio per tot jam sæcula morem Retulit. Some Mss. have *tot jam per sæcula*, a more classical and Virgilian arrangement.

XI. De Bell. Get. 14. Licet omnia vates In majus celebrata ferant, — Nil veris æquale dabunt. Thucyd. i. 10. νομίζειν δὲ τὴν στρατιὰν ἐκείνην μεγίστην μὲν γενέσθαι τῶν πρὸ αὐτῆς, λειπομένην δὲ τῶν νῦν, τῇ Ὀμήρου αὐτὴ ποιήσει εἴ τι χρὴ κατὰ τοῦτα πιστεύειν, ἢν εἰκὸς ἐπὶ τὸ μείζον μὲν ποιητὴν ὄντα κοσμεῖσθαι, ὅμως δὲ φαίνεται καὶ οὕτως ἐνδεεστέρα. This imitation is remarkable, inasmuch as Claudian has copied even the idiom of the original. VI. Cons. Hon. 475, on a similar occasion : si qua fides augentibus omnia Musis —. De Laud. Stilich. i. 104.

XII. De Raptu Proserp. ii. 40. Collectæ tereti nodantur iaspide vestes. Pectinis ingenio nunquam felicior arti Contigit eventus : nullæ sic consona telæ Fila, nec in tantam veriduxere figuram. The 41st verse is evidently corrupt. We think it not improbable that Claudian wrote : Collectæ tereti nodantur iaspide vestes, Pectinis ingenium. Nunquam, &c.;—and that *ingenium* by a very difficult process, was corrupted into *ingen*.

XIII. Epist. ii. 33. Sed quod Threicio Juno placabilis

Orphei, Hoc poteris, &c. We prefer the various reading *Orpheo*, as more consonant to the ordinary usage of the Roman poets, and, among the rest, of Claudian himself.

XIV. Idyll. i. 50. O senium positura rogo, falsisque sepulcris Natales habitare vices, qui sæpe renasci Exitio, proprioque soles pubescere leto. We have little doubt that Claudian wrote *Exitus*.

XV. Idyll. iii. 18. Per setam vis alfa meat, fluctusque relinquit Absentem tenturæ virum. The true reading is probably *vinctura*. The alliteration with *v*, so much a favorite with all the Latin poets, is of itself almost an argument in its favor.

XVI. Idyll. iv. 15. (of the Nile) Inde vago lapsu Libyam dispersus in omnem Æthiopum per mille ruit migrantia regna, Et loca continuo Solis damnata vapore Irrorat, populisque salus sitientibus errat — Hence perhaps Akenside's picture (Pleasures of Imagination, book i.) of

Nilus or Gauges rolling his broad wave  
Through mountains, plains, through empires black with  
shade,

And continents of sand.

Compare Thomson's description of the Nile, in his *Summer*, which is greatly in the luxuriant manner of Claudian.

XVII. In a former part of this paper, *Classical Journal*, No. LXXI. p. 14, art. LXIII. l. 12, correct: "Read *Secura erraret Daphne: si littore Naxi*—" — Ibid. p. 16, art. LXVIII. "Longo tu tramite nudos," &c. Perhaps this passage was in Pope's mind, when he wrote his panegyric on the Man of Ross. Pope's familiarity with Statius is well known. "I even then," says he, speaking of the period of his juvenile studies, "liked Tasso better than Ariosto, as I do still; and Statius, of all the Latin poets, by much, next to Virgil." Spence's *Anecdotes*, p. 278, Singer's edition. (We quote at second-hand, from Roscoe's *Pope*, Vol. i. p. 25.) In this predilection, extraordinary as it may appear, Pope does not stand alone. Mallebranche, and in our own days Southey, have not scrupled even to maintain the superiority of Statius to Virgil.—Ibid. p. 17. art. LXX. "ibant Ostentare choros," &c. This favorite form of expression, it may be observed, is a Grecism.—Ib. p. 19. art. LXXX. Scipio sic plenos Latio Jove ducere somnos creditur (al. Creditus) Ausoniis. Perhaps Statius wrote *Ausonidis*. The common reading appears too simple and obvious for Statius's style of writing.



## SALE OF THE REV. H. DRURY'S LIBRARY.

No. III.—[*Concluded from No. LXXII.*]

### EIGHTH DAY'S SALE.

#### OCTAVO ET INFRA.

Euripidis Opera Omnia, Latina Interpretatione, Scholiis Antiquis, et eruditorum Observationibus illustrata: necnon indicibus omnigenis instructa, 9 vol. large paper, red morocco, gilt leaves, by C. Lewis, Glasgwa, 1821.—3*l.* 17*s.*

Euripidis Tragoediae et Fragmenta, recensuit, scholia Graeca e Codicibus Mss. partim supplevit partim emendavit A. Matthiae, 6 vol. russia extra, gilt leaves, by Lewis, Lipsiae, 1813.—5*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

Flori (L. Annaei) Epitome Rerum Romanarum ex Editione Fischeri, cum Notis et Interpret. in Usum Delphini, variis Lectionibus et Notis variorum accurate recensita, 3 vol. large paper, red morocco, by Lewis, Londini, Valpy, 1822.—3*l.* 19*s.*

Geographiae Veteris Scriptores Graeci Minores. cum Interpretatione Latina, Dissertationibus, ac Annotationibus, cura Jo. Hudsoni, 4 vol. fine copy, red morocco, gilt leaves, Oxon. 1698-1712.—9*l.*

#### QUARTO.

Epicteti quae supersunt Dissertationes ab Arriano collectae, nec non Enchiridion et Fragmenta, Gr. et Lat. cum Notis variorum, recensuit Jo. Uptonus, 2 vol. large paper, green morocco, gilt leaves, by Fairbairn, Lond. 1739.—4*l.* 10*s.*

Euripidis quae extant omnia, cum variis Lectionibus et Notis, cura S. Musgrave, 4 vol. russia extra, Oxon. 1778.—4*l.* 4*s.*

Euripidis quae extant omnia, Gr. et Lat. cum Scholiis, ex recensione Beckii, 4 tom. bound in russia, gilt leaves, with joints, by Hering, Lipsiae, 1778.—4*l.* 18*s.*

Euripidis Tragoedia quae inscribitur Phoenissae, Graece. A very elegantly written Manuscript, on paper made from silk; it was formerly in the Collection of the Jesuits "Collegii Claromontani," and afterwards in the Meermann Library. Bound in blue morocco, by Lewis.—20*l.* 5*s.*

#### FOLIO.

Dioscoridis (Pedacii) Anabarzei de Materia Medica Libri sex. De Alexipharmacis et Theriacis Libri tres, septimi, octavi et noni nominibus insigniti. Nicandri Colophonii Theriaca et Alexipharmaca, cum Scholiis. The ten leaves of the Scholia on Nicander, printed in columns, are so extremely rare, that Renouard says in the first edition of his *Annales des Aldes*, "Je ne les ai encore vus dans aucun exemplaire." Very fine copy, in French red morocco, gilt leaves. This book, when complete as the present, may be considered one of the principal gems in a Collection of Aldines. Venetiis, apud Aldum, mense Julio, M. I. D.—30*l.*

## Sale of the Rev. H. Drury's Library. 69

Du Cange Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediæ et Infimæ Latinitatis, 6 vol. large paper. Carpentier Supplementum, 4 vol. The Supplement was not printed on large paper.—Together 10 vol. Paris, 1733-1766.—11*l.* 13*s.*

Ercolano, Antichite di; Le Pitture, 5 vol. Le Bronzo, 2 vol. Le Lucerne, 1 vol. Catalogo, 1 vol.—together 9 vol. very fine copy, red morocco, gilt leaves, Napoli, 1757.—35*l.* 14*s.*

Etymologicum Magnum, Græcæ, Editio Princeps, very fine tall copy, elegantly bound, in russia, with joints, gilt leaves, by Lewis, Venetiis, sumptibus Nic. Blasti, opera Zachariæ Calliergi, MCCCXCIX.—6*l.*

Eusebius Pamphilus, de Evangelica Preparatione, First Edition, very fine copy, with illuminated capitals, splendidly bound in red morocco, with joints, by Lewis, Venetiis, Nicolaus Jenson, MCCCCLXX.—4*l.* 6*s.*

Euclidis et Aliorum insignium Peripateticorum Commentaria in Libros decem Aristotelis de Moribus ad Nicomachum una cum Textu suis in locis adjecto, Græcæ; very beautiful copy, uncut throughout, and in the finest preservation, bound in red morocco, by Lewis. Venetiis, in Aedibus Hæredum Aldi Manutii et Andreæ Asulani Soceri, 1536.—8*l.* 8*s.*

### NINTH DAY'S SALE.

#### OCTAVO ET INFRA.

Ginguené Histoire Littéraire d'Italie, avec la continuation par F. Salfi, 10 vol. Paris, 1811-1823.—4*l.* 4*s.*

Guarini Veronensis Lexicon Græco-Latinum—Ejusdem de Aspiratione Græcarum Dictionum Tractatus. An inedited Greek Manuscript of the Fifteenth Century, very beautifully written on vellum. The first page of the text and the capital letters throughout are elegantly painted in gold and colors. This valuable Ms. came from the Collection of the Nani at Venice, and is in the rich original binding, with gilt leaves.—10*l.*

Herodiani Historiarum Libri octo, Gr. et Lat. cum Notis variorum, curante F. G. Irmisch, 5 vol. large paper, rare, red morocco, gilt leaves, Lipsiæ, 1789.—5*l.* 10*s.*

Herodotus, Gr. et Lat. ex editionibus Wesselingii et Reitzii, 7 vol. large paper, yellow morocco, gilt leaves, Edinburgi, 1806.—3*l.* 19*s.*

#### QUARTO.

Fabricii Bibliotheca Græca, sive Notitia Scriptorum Veterum Græcorum, cum Notis variorum, curante G. C. Harles, 12 vol. large paper, red morocco, gilt leaves, by Hering, Hamburgi, 1790, &c.—16*l.* 5*s.*

#### FOLIO.

Facciolati (Jac.) Totius Latinitatis Lexicon, opera et studio Ægidii Forcellini, 4 vol. in 2, russia extra, with joints, Patav. 1771. Appendix ad Lexicon Forcellini, Patav. 1816, half bound in russia. Together 3 vol.—9*l.* 12*s.*

Firmici Materni Junioris (Julii) Libri Astronomici sive Matheseos Libri viii. Explicant foeliciter MCCCCLXVIII. A Manuscript written on

## 70 *Sale of the Rev. H. Drury's Library.*

very pure Italian vellum, with a splendid illumination on the first page: in russia, gilt leaves.—4*l.* 19*s*.

Flori (Lucii Annei) Epithomæ Tito Livio incipit—Ciceronis Orationes Philippicæ. A valuable Ms. written in the Thirteenth Century, in double columns, and on vellum. Mss. of Florus are of unusual occurrence. In russia.—4*l.* 18*s*.

Galenii Opera Omnia, Græce, ediderunt And. Asulanus et J. B. Opizo, 5 vol. first edition, fine copy, in yellow morocco, gilt leaves, from the Mac Carthy Collection, Venet. Aldus, 1525.—9*l.* 5*s*.

### TENTH DAY'S SALE.

#### OCTAVO ET INFRA.

Herodotus, recensuit, Lectionis Varietate, continua Interpretatione Latina, adnotationibus Wesselingii et Valckenarii aliorumque et suis illustravit J. Schweighæuser, 6 vol. Lexicon Herodoteum instruxit J. Schweighæuser, 2 vol. in 1.—Together 7 vol. large paper, red morocco, gilt leaves, by Lewis, Argent. 1816-1824.—11*l.* 6*d*.

Herodotus, Gr. et Lat. cum Notis variorum, ex editione J. Schweighæuseri, cum versione Lat. et Forti Lexicon, 6 vol. red morocco, gilt leaves, Glasgæ, 1818.—4*l.* 10*s*.

Herodoti Historiarum Libri ix. Codicem Sanctrofti Manuscriptum denno contulit, annotationes variorum adjecit T. Gaisford. 6 vol. large paper, very rare, red morocco, gilt leaves, by Lewis, Oxon. 1824.—15*l.* 4*s.* 6*d*.

Herodotus. Histoire, traduite du Grec, avec des Remarques Historiques et Critiques, un Essai sur la Chronologie, et une Table Géographique, par Larcher, 9 vol. Paris, 1802.—4*l.* 10*s*.

Homeri Ilias et Odyssea, et Didymi Scholia in Odysseam, Gr. 3 vol. fine copies, red morocco, gilt leaves, Venet. Aldus, 1524-1528.—5*l.* 5*s*.

Homeri Opera Omnia, ex recensione et cum Notis S. Clarkii, cura J. A. Ernesti, 5 vol. large paper, red morocco, gilt leaves, by Lewis, Glasgæ, 1814.—9*l.*

Homeri Ilias cum brevi Annotatione, accedunt variæ Lectiones et Observationes veterum Grammaticorum cum nostræ ætatis critica, curante C. G. Heyne, 8 tom. Tomus nonus Indices continens, confectus ab E. A. G. Griesenhan. Best paper, elegantly bound in russia, with joints, borders of gold, gilt leaves, Lipsiæ, 1800-1822.—13*l.* 13*s*.

Homeri Ilias cum brevi Annotatione, curante C. G. Heyne, accedunt Scholia Minora, nec non Heraclidis Allegoriæ Homericae et Heynii Excursus in Homerum, 3 vol. large paper, elegantly bound in green morocco, by Lewis, Oxon. 1821-2.—4*l.*

Horatius, red morocco, first Aldine edition, very rare, Venetiis, apud Aldum, 1501.—7*l.* 15*s*.

Horatii Opera. Æneis Tabulis incidit Jo. Pine, 2 vol. Original edition, very fine copy, red morocco, gilt leaves, Lond. 1733.—4*l.* 2*s*.

Horatii Opera, illustravit C. G. Mitscherlich, tom. 1 and 2, (all published,) best paper, elegantly bound in green morocco, gilt leaves, Lipsiæ, 1800.—4*l.* 14*s.* 6*d*.

#### FOLIO.

Gregorii (Sancti Papæ) Liber Omeliarum in Extremam Partem Ezechielis Prophætæ. Very ancient Manuscript of the Twelfth or

Thirteenth Century, on vellum, curiously accented throughout. In red velvet binding.—4*l.* 11*s.*

Gruteri (Jani) Inscriptiones Antiquæ totius orbis Romani, cura J. G. Grævii, 4 vol. large paper, Amstel. 1707.—4*l.*

Herodoti Historiarum Libri IX. Gr. et Lat. Editionem curavit et suas itemque L. C. Valekenarii notas adjecit Petrus Wesselingius, russia extra, with joints, uncut, Amstel. 1763.—5*l.*

Hesychii Lexicon, cum notis doctorum virorum editis et ineditis, recensuit, suasque animadvertiones adjecit Jo. Alberti, 2 vol. large paper, very fine copy in vellum, Lugd. Bat. 1746.—4*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.*

Hieronymi (Sancti Episebii) Opera Omnia, studio et labore Monachorum Ordinis S. Benedicti, 5 vol. Paris, 1693.—6*l.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

Hieronymi Epistolæ, cum præfatione Joannis Andreae Episcopi Aleriensis, 2 vol. first edition with a date, very rare. The following curious autograph manuscript note by Cardinal Caprari appears at the end of the second volume, "Hanc secundam partem Epistolarum Beati Jeronimi una cum prima parte emi Romæ pro pretio X. ducatorum et pro portu II. ducatorum. Et pro religatura, rubricatura et clausuris VI. ducatorum. Anno Dom. M.cccc.lx. octavo. quas ordinavi reponi in libraria mea in Memingen. Summa totalis XX. florinorum Romanorum."—"De Caprariis." Cardinalis. This copy is so fine, that Dr. Dibdin has written in the first volume the following note, "I am not sure, whether, on the whole, this be not the finest copy of the work which I ever saw." Superbly bound in russia, with joints, gilt leaves, by Lewis, Romæ, per Conrad. Sweynheym et Arnold. Pannartz, MCCCCLXVIII.—14*l.* 18*s.*

Hieronymi (Sancti) Epistolæ. The voluminous correspondence of St. Jerom is of unusual occurrence in manuscript. The present Ms. is written on vellum in a small but legible character, and appears to be of the early part of the Fifteenth Century. Red morocco.—6*l.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

## ELEVENTH DAY'S SALE.

### OCTAVO ET INFRA.

Juvenalis Opera Omnia ex Editione Rupertiana cum Notis et Interpretatione in usum Delphini, Notis variorum et Indice. 2 vol. large paper, red morocco, gilt leaves, Lond. Valpy, 1820.—6*l.*

Juvenalis Satiræ, perpetuo Commentario illustratæ a G. A. Ruperti. Quibus adjectæ sunt Persii Satiræ ex recens. et cum Notis G. L. Kœnig, 2 vol. large paper, green morocco, gilt leaves, by Lewis, Glasguae, 1825.—5*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

### QUARTO.

Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres; avec les Tables, 51 vol. a perfect copy, Paris, 1736.—35*l.*

Homeri Ilias et Odyssea, et in easdem Scholia, sive Interpretatio Didymi, cum Latina versione accuratissima, Indiceque Græco locupletissimo, accurate C. Schrevelio. 2 vol. large paper, extremely rare, very fine copy, from the White-Knights collection. Elegantly bound in green morocco, with joints, borders of gold, gilt leaves, by Lewis; two Busts of Homer engraved by Schiavonetti inserted. Dr. Dibdin in his Bibliographical Tour, gives an accurate description of this copy. Lugd. Bat. 1656.—13*l.* 5*s.*

## 72 *Sale of the Rev. H. Drury's Library.*

Horatii Opera, cum Interpretatione et Notis, à Lud. Desprez, in usum Delphini, 2 vol. crimson morocco, gilt leaves, by Lewis, Paris. 1691.—4*l.* 10*s.*

Horatius ex recensione et cum Notis atque Emendationibus R. Bentleyi, large paper, russia, from Dr. Heath's collection, Amstel. 1713.—4*l.* 4*s.*

### FOLIO.

Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Scriptores; Eusebii, Socratis, Sozomeni, Theodoretii et Evagrii Opera, Gr. & Lat. Observationibus criticis G. Reading illustrata, 3 vol. large paper, very fine copy, gilt leaves, Cantab. 1720.—7*l.* 10*s.*

Homerus. Iliadis Fragmenta Antiquissima, cum Picturis, item Scholia vetera in Odysseam edente Angelo Maio, superbly bound in russia, with joints, borders of gold, &c. by C. Lewis, Mediol. 1819.—7*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.*

Homeri Ilias et Odyssea, una cum Batrachomyomachia et Hymnis: cum Prefatione Græca Demetrii Chalcondylæ et Latina Bernardi Nerlii typographi ad Petrum Medices Laurentii Filium: præmiss. Herod. ac Plutarch. de Vita Homeri et Dionis Chrysostomi Dissertatione. First Edition. A most splendid specimen of typography, and of great literary importance, as appears by the following extract from Harles's Fabricius, vol. i. p. 414.: "Permultæ sunt in hac editione lectiones bonæ, quæ temere postea neglectæ sunt: hinc ab Ernestio ad textum Homeri melius constituendum utiliter est collata: diligentior tamen meret curam ad comparandam illam cum reliquis."

The present is a very fine copy from the Harleian Library, and has been recently splendidly rebound in Two Volumes, in red morocco, with joints, &c. by Lewis. Florentiæ, mcccclxxxviii.—44*l.* 2*s.*

Horatius—Persius—Juvenalis. A more valuable Latin Classical Ms. than the present will not be found in the Catalogues of the most celebrated collections of Mss. including those of the late Dr. Burney and Professor Meermann. It is in folio, written on vellum, in the large uncial Roman character, with the name of the scribe at the end of each author, and the date of mcccxc. affixed to the Horace. The Juvenal is thus concluded, "Stephanus scripsit istud volumen." Its intrinsic excellence is not inferior to the splendor of its writing, and the readings are said to be optimæ notæ: bound in hog-skin, with joints, by Lewis.—56*l.* 14*s.*

Ihre (Jo.) Glossarium Suo-Gothicum, 2 vol. in 1, elegantly bound in hog-skin, gilt leaves, by Lewis, Upsaliæ, 1769.—6*l.* 10*s.*

### TWELFTH DAY'S SALE.

#### OCTAVO ET INFRA.

Livii Historiarum Libri cum Notis Variorum cura Gronovii, 3 vol. red morocco, gilt leaves, Amstel. 1679.—5*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Livius ex recensione Drakenborchii, cura H. Homeri, 8 vol. russia extra, gilt leaves, Lond. 1794.—4*l.* 9*s.*

#### QUARTO.

Joannis (Sancti) Apocalypsis cum Commentario interlineari et ad

marginem apposito et Jacobi Epistolæ. Ms. of the Twelfth Century on vellum.—4*l.* 7*s.*

# FOLIO.

Josephi (Flavii) Opera Omnia, cura Hudsoni, 2 vol. large paper, elegantly bound in russia, uncut, Oxon. 1720.—5*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Josephi (Flavii) Opera Omnia, Gr. et Lat. cum Notis Hudsoni et Variorum: Omnia collegit, disposuit notasque suas adjecit Sigebertus Havercampus, 2 vol. large paper, remarkably fine copy in French red morocco, gilt leaves, Amstel. 1726.—5*l.* 15*s.*

Justiniani (Divi Sacratissimi Principis) Constitutiones incipiunt, cum Glossis ad Marginem apposis. A most splendid Manuscript of the Twelfth Century, on vellum. It is written in the same bold character as the Gratian, which excited so much competition two years ago, and the commencement of each book is enriched with a highly illuminated miniature, and the capitals throughout are grotesquely ornamented. It is one of the most valuable Mss. in the collection, both in intrinsic worth and embellishments. Bound in red velvet.—17*l.*

Justini Historiarum Compendium ex Trogo Pompeio. On vellum, a very valuable Ms. as appears by the following Colophon, "Ex emendatissimo Guarini Veron. exemplari transcriptus ab Alessio Germanico. Anno dñi ihesu christi mccccxxxiii. Post autem ad idem exemplar emendavit Martinus Rizonius, Veron. ipsius Guarini discipulus," bound in blue morocco. The capitals are richly illuminated.—8*l.* 13*s.*

Justini Epithomatis in Libros quadraginta quatuor Pompeii Trogi Prohemium incipit. Manuscript of the Fifteenth Century, elegantly written on vellum, with illuminated capitals; in yellow morocco, with joints, by Lewis.—5*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

## THIRTEENTH DAY'S SALE.

### OCTAVO ET INFRA.

Lucanus (Marcus Anneus) de Bello Pharsalico, cum Glossis. Ms. on vellum, very prettily written in the Italian cursive hand, with illuminated capitals. It is of the 14th Century. Russia.—4*l.* 4*s.*

Lucanus. A most ancient Manuscript on vellum, probably of the Twelfth Century.—4*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.*

Luciani Opera, Gr. et Lat. ex editione Hemsterhusii et Reitzii, cum varietate Lectionis et Annotationibus, 10 vol. large paper, rare, red morocco, gilt leaves, Biponti, 1789.—7*l.* 7*s.*

Lucretius, ad exemplar G. Wakefield, cum ejusdem Notis, Commentariis et Indicibus. Adjectæ sunt editionum quinque, in quibus principis Ferrandi Lectiones variantes omnes, ut et R. Bentleyi Annotationes, 4 vol. large paper, green morocco, gilt leaves, by Lewis, Glasgæ, 1813.—4*l.* 8*s.*

Lucretii Cari de Rerum Natura Libri sex, ex editione Gilberti Wakefieldi, cum Notis et Interpretatione in usum Delphini, Notis Variorum et Indice, 3 vol. large paper, red morocco, gilt leaves, by Lewis, Londini, Valpy, 1823.—4*l.* 8*s.*

Livii Historiarum quæ exstant, cum Interpretatione et Notis, a J. Doujatio, in usum Delphini, 6 vol. crimson morocco, gilt leaves, by Lewis, from sheets, Paris, 1679.—8*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

## 74 *Sale of the Rev. H. Drury's Library.*

*Livii Historia cum Supplementis Freinsheimii, recensuit et Notis illustravit J. B. L. Crevier*, 6 vol. large paper, fine copy, French calf, gilt leaves, from Dr. Heath's Library, Paris, 1735.—4*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.*

*Livii Historiarum Libri, qui supersunt, omnes, cum Notis Variorum, curante Drakenborchio*, 7 vol. large paper, fine copy in French calf, gilt leaves, from Dr. Heath's Library, Lugd. Bat. 1738.—19*l.* 10*s.*

*Lucanus*. A very ancient Ms. on vellum, written in a small hand, and containing most valuable scholia. It was recently obtained from Rome, and is of great literary importance. It is what is termed a "Codex Palimpsestus" of some Latin Poet, in long and short verses. In old red morocco.—8*l.* 8*s.*

*Luciani Opera cum nova versione Hemsterhusii et Gesneri, Græcis scholiis et Notis Variorum, curis Hemsterhusii et Reitzii*, 4 vol. large paper, very fine copy, bound in red morocco by Roger Payne, Amstel. 1743.—13*l.*

*Lucretius cum Notis Variorum, curante S. Havercampo*, 2 vol. fine copy in blue morocco, gilt leaves, Lugd. Bat. 1725.—7*l.* 15*s.*

### FOLIO.

*Kircheri (Athanasii) Oedipus Aegyptiacus, hoc est Universalis Hieroglyphicæ Veterum Doctrinæ temporum injuria abolitæ Instauratio*, 4 vol. plates, fine copy in vellum. Rome, 1652.—4*l.* 16*s.*

*Labruzzi (Carlo) Via Appia Illustrata ab Urbe Roma ad Capuam*, plates, half bound in russia.—4*l.*

*Lactantii Firmiani Institutiones*. One of the most splendid Manuscripts in the Collection. It is written on the purest Italian vellum, in the Roman Character, and the capital letters are illuminated in a very singular and tasteful style, with a freshness and brilliancy of coloring quite admirable. It is of the Fifteenth Century, and is bound in hog-skin, with joints, by Lewis.—11*l.* 11*s.*

*Lactantii (Carli Firmiani) Opera*. Very fine copy in old russia, from the Harleian and Meermann Libraries. This Edition contains many better readings than either of the former. Conradus Sweynheym et Arnoldus Pannartz, MCCCCLXX.—5*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

*Leonis (Sancti Papæ) Sermones—Libellus S. Hieronymi contra Helvidium—Augustini Epistola ad Volusianum—Epistola altera ad Volusianum*. Ms. in double Columns, very finely written, with elegantly illuminated capitals. At the end is a fly-leaf, containing the following Latin Hymn on Transubstantiation, with the Music:

Sumit unus sumunt mille  
Quantum iste tantum ille  
Nec sumptus consumitur  
Sumunt boni rumunt mali  
Sorte tamen inæquali  
Vitæ vel interitus  
Mors est malis Vita bonis  
Vide panis sumptionis  
Quam sit impar exitus  
Fracto demum sacramento  
Nec vacilles sed memento  
Tantum esse sub fragmento  
Tantum totum tegitur."

In the original binding: from the Library of Sancta Justina, at Padua.—4*l.* 10*s.*

## Review of Rose's *Ancient Inscriptions.* 75

Leonis Papæ Sermones. Manuscript on vellum, with elegantly illuminated capitals. It is of the 15th Century, Russia, by Lewis.—3*l.* 19*s.*

Livii (Titi Patavini) Decas Quatuor de Bello Macedonico. A very splendid Manuscript of the Fifteenth Century on vellum, written in a clear and legible hand, with illuminated capitals. Russia, with joints, by Lewis.—11*l.* 5*s.*

Livii (Titi Patavini) Historiarum Prima Decas. Manuscript on vellum very legibly written. The first page is wanting; it concludes thus: "Titi Livii Patavini liber X. explicit die 21 Septemb. MCCCCLVI." Russia, gilt leaves.—4*l.* 15*s.*

Livii (Titi Patavini) de Bello Macedonico Decas Tertia—Finis hujus Libri die xv. Decembris. MCCCCLXI. On vellum, with capitals illuminated.—5*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Lucanus. Codex Ms. Chartaceus cum Scholiis quam plurimis ad margines. It concludes thus,

"M. Annei Lucani explicit liber decimus

O Scriptor cessa tua nam manus est tibi fessa.

Scriptum Mediolani Anno MCCCCLII."—4*l.* 19*s.*

Lucani (M. A.) Pharsalia. Manuscript on paper, which concludes with the following date:

"Expletus est sub M.CCCC.LXIV et die xx. Novembris hora secunda noctis, per me Andream petri de Villari."—Green morocco.—4*l.* 11*s.*

---

### TRANSLATION OF

a Review of ROSE's *Inscriptiones Græcæ vetustissimæ.*

BY C. O. MÜLLER.

---

THE contents of this collection are as follows:—*Prolegomena*, chiefly relating to the history of the art of writing in Greece. *First class*,—Inscriptions written *βουστροφῆδον*, or from right to left. *Second class*,—Inscriptions written in the common manner, but otherwise remarkable from their antiquity and the form of the letters. *Third class*,—Attic inscriptions of the time preceding the archonship of Euclid; first, those of which the date can be accurately determined; and next, those where it is uncertain. *Fourth class*,—Recent inscriptions with the digamma. Here some Orchomenian, Tapagræan, and Theban inscriptions, in which the digamma is used, are, on account of the similarity of the contents, combined with several decrees of Corcyra, Acarnania, Delphi, Agrigentum, and, on account of the origin and dialect, with other Orchomenian and Boeotian monuments. *Fifth class*,—Inscriptions of the time immediately succeeding the archonship of Euclid. *Sixth class*,—Spurious or doubtful inscriptions (of which, however, the larger part are put here without sufficient reason). The *Appendix* contains extracts from the



writings chiefly of English scholars, relating to inscriptions either published or referred to in the body of the work, and also very accurate transcripts made by Reuvens and Dobree of the Greek inscriptions preserved at Trinity College, Cambridge. The reasons which induced Mr. Rose to publish in one volume the particular inscriptions which he has collected, are, (he states) that they contribute most materially to the *ἐκγνῶσις* of the Greek language, for which purpose inscriptions are the more important the more ancient they are, and the more they belong to times of which we have few written memorials. At the same time, the archonship of Euclid, although it was the era of important changes in the writing of public monuments at Athens, can hardly be considered as an epoch for the philological importance of inscriptions. Mr. Rose also lays great stress on the circumstance that a large part of his inscriptions are published by him for the first time: for the Germans, however, this is the case with only a few, as he had been anticipated by the two first Numbers of the *Corpus Inscriptionum* published by the Academy of Berlin. He also complains that Professor Osann had anticipated him in publishing several very important inscriptions, and, as he accuses him of having, without permission, made use of his copies for the *Sylloge Inscriptionum*, he begins a controversy, which (whatever might have been the justice of the proceeding,) is introduced in a quarrelsome and illiberal manner. With regard to the *transcripts* which Mr. Rose has used, they are for the most part very accurate; more particularly those made from stones which are preserved in England. In this case the editor could compare again and again his copies with the originals, and, if he pleased, give them an accuracy, which is unattainable by the mere traveller, who (as was the case with the writer of this article) can only revise his transcript once after a short interval of time. Hence the transcripts which the editor has published do not agree in every point with those which he had formerly sent to the Academy of Berlin; in most instances, however, the editor of the *Corpus Inscriptionum* had ascertained by conjecture what is now confirmed from the original stones. Thus *e. g.* in No. 141. line 42. Böckh, instead of **ΑΡΑ** . . . reads **ΑΡΑΥΡΟΝ** (*ἀρῦρουν*), Mr. Rose has **ΑΡΑΥ**; in line 34 Böckh had supplied the whole word *ἑξαμύατος*, of which Mr. Rose reads eight letters &c. In several places, too, the editor gives the *στοιχῆδον* order of the letters more accurately than before. Thus we see from the 24th plate of Mr. Rose's work, that in No. 140 of the *Corpus Inscriptionum*, the second part of the inscription is

directly under the first, and that the first line should receive three letters of the second; the second, two letters of the third; and so on. In the inscription, Plate XXIX in Rose, No. 144 in Böckh, the text is now nearer to the readings of Chaudler and Osann, than he had formerly given it. The Reviewer cannot, however, always place intire confidence in the editor's accuracy; c. g. in the Choiseul inscription, Plate XX, (No. 148 in the *Corpus Inscriptionum*), the words **ΑΘΕΝΑΙΑΙΝΙΚΕΙ** frequently occurring, in the most inconvenient places, (*εἰς τὴν διαβεβησαν Ἀθηναία Νίκην*), of which the writer of this article saw no trace, and which have been every where thrown out by Böckh, can hardly have been in fact read by Mr. Rose; indeed, from *his own* papers, the reviewer must consider that many parts of this particular copy are erroneously represented. Yet the accuracy of the transcripts is by far the most valuable part of this work; and if copies, such as these of Mr. Rose, are compared with those of Montfaucon, Muratori, &c., the superior accuracy of the present age will be at once evident. With regard, however, to the manner in which the inscriptions are treated, for which to be successful, an accurate knowlege of the contents must be combined with happy conjecture; in this Mr. Rose, however praiseworthy his endeavors, appears to be greatly wanting in the knowlege with which the undertaking of the Berlin Academy is conducted. Mr. Rose also expresses himself in respect to his mental and personal relation to the Berlin Professor with so much modesty on the one hand, and esteem on the other, that he appears to be far indeed from entertaining any notions of rivalry. In Germany, however, where the native always loses 90 *per cent.* in value because he is a native, while the foreigner rises in equal proportion, it is by no means impossible that Mr. Rose will be held up as an example to the Berlin Professor.<sup>1</sup> In the mean time compare No. 140 in Böckh, with Cl. iii. Sect. 2. Inscript. No. 1. in Rose, where the same inscription is left almost untouched, while, in the former work, notwithstanding a very small portion remains, it is restored, in the most convincing manner, from materials which were also accessible to the English scholar; and sense and connexion are every where discoverable, although there may, here and there, have been a few discrepancies in the exact words. Neither was Mr. Rose able to determine

---

<sup>1</sup> This alludes to a passage in Hermann's attack on Bockh's *Inscriptions*; at the end of which, after having used every fair and unfair weapon against that work his ingenuity could devise, he mentions Mr. Rose's book with praise.

## 78 *Review of Rose's Ancient Inscriptions.*

anything with regard to the dates of the lists of sacred offerings, of which this inscription is one; which have been most ingeniously ascertained by Böckh.—Nor do we find fault that Mr. Rose so continually trusts to the authority of others, and frequently quotes whole passages, as well from printed books as from the private communications of both English and German correspondents; only the reviewer would have preferred it, if the author had not quoted *only* that part, which he himself adopts: refutation from private correspondence appears objectionable. Frequently, also, Mr. Rose evidently does not understand the reasoning of his correspondent, e. g. Cl. 2. I. 2. p. 56. where his friend doubtless untied, and did not cut, the knot; the passage, however, has been made unintelligible by one of the press errors which are unluckily very frequent in this book. It is also very singular that Mr. Rose should find a *Zeὺς Τυρρῆν* in Böckh's explanation of the inscription on the helmet found at Olympia (Cl. 2. I. 6. p. 67.). Nor has the writer of this article been by any means pleased to see a large part of his treatise on Minerva Polias reprinted, as it has now become antiquated since the appearance of the masterly explanation in the *Corpus Inscriptionum*; least of all, however, he expected to be accused of *petulance*, for saying of a French traveller named Guilletière, *nuntiri videtur*. Mr. Rose's defence (p. 151.), *Guilletière, quantum ego judicare possum, fides semper integra*, shows that he knew nothing of the history of this Guilletière and his controversy with Jaques Spon. Nor would he have attempted to defend Wilkins' knowledge of Greek (whom, however, the reviewer esteems very highly, and laments very much that he has caused him any uneasiness), had he remembered the explanation of the Attic inscription, ΑΙΔΕΙΣΑΘΗΝΑΙ, which Wilkins reads thus, αἰδεῖς, Ἀθήνας, &c. The reviewer is unable, from want of space, to examine the book more in detail; he will only remark that some excellent notes of the distinguished critic Dobree on the Petilian inscription are given by Mr. Rose, which completely agree with the explanations in the *Corpus Inscriptionum* (compare also Appendix, p. 408.). The same scholar also furnishes many good remarks on the Orchomenian inscriptions, the inscriptions in Trinity College, the Crissæan and Leucadian, which he treats with ingenuity, but too great boldness, and many

nothing has been yet said concerning the *Prolegomena*, we may add, that they present little novelty for any person who has gone through the series of the early inscriptions in the *Corpus Inscriptionum*; and that the errors of former writers,

who had not sufficient materials for palæographic inquiries, are refuted at too great length. At the same time, Mr. Rose lays too little weight on the testimony of ancient grammarians, as he entirely rejects their statement that the aspirate letters were once written ΚΗ, ΠΗ, ΤΗ. Nor are there any sufficient reasons for considering the famous inscription ΠΑΙ ΔΙΟΣ ΕΚ-ΠΗΑΝΤΟΙ, as spurious; indeed, Böckh has already proved its genuineness against Whiersch in the most satisfactory manner. To those, however, who are little versed in these studies, the collections of the author may be useful; the tabular arrangement of the alterations of consonants at the end of words for the sake of euphony, (which are observed with tolerable regularity in the more ancient inscriptions, ἐγ Βενδιδαίων, ἐγ λιμένος, ἱερῶν χρημάτων, τῶν λογιστῶν, τὸν βασιλῆα, ἐς Σάμω,) is very acceptable, and may give many persons a notion of the difference in the orthography of the present texts of ancient authors and the original manuscript, of Æschylus for example.

C. OT. MULLER.

---

## DE DIFFERENTIA PROSÆ ET POETICÆ ORATIONIS DISPUTATIO.

A GODOF. HERMANNO.

MDCCCXCIV.

---

### PARS I.<sup>1</sup>

(1) DISCIPLINAS artium prægrediuntur ipsæ artes. Inventrix enim artium natura vel necessitas, perfectorque usus est: disciplina vero otii est et meditationis opus. Quare alias artes tunc maxime floruisse videmus, quum aut nulla earum, aut tenuis admodum disciplina esset; ab aliis autem ita spretam animadvertimus omnem disciplinam, ut, quam ea viam monstraret, hanc etiam vitare viderentur. Neque immerito. Magis enim disciplina quam ars obnoxia est erroribus, quia vel male positis fundamentis, vel ratio-

---

<sup>1</sup> Publice defensa est ad locum in Ordine Philosophorum Lipsiensi obtinendum die ix. Martii a. MDCCCXCIII. socio Edvardo Platnero, Lipsiensi, qui nunc Professor juris est in Academia Marburgensi.

nibus non recte conclusis, specie ordinis cujusdam fallere doctorem solet: quod contra ars, quæ ducem naturam, admonitorem autem effectum habet, difficilius a vero abducî se patitur. Itaque quum excultis jam artibus disciplinæ paullatim invenirentur, non raro accidit, ut aut disciplinæ accessio molesta quadam exilitate pristinam artibus dignitatem detraheret, aut ipsæ disciplinæ, ubi earum inventores naturam artium non recte intellexissent, tum non omnem artem complecterentur, tum, falsis alierisque admixtis, mirum in modum depravarentur. Horum omnium ars rhetorica luculentissimum exemplum existit. Quæ quum primum apud Græcos, plerarumque artium et doctrinarum repertores, exorta esset, initio in exercitatione quadam copiose ornateque dicendi constitit; mox vero hominum eloquentiæ laude florentium opera disciplinæ quædam ratio et præceptorum subtilitas accessit. Sed quum universa dicendi vis et facultas potissimum in causis judicialibus, in negotiis publicis, (2) in sollemnibus laudationibus versaretur, fieri non potuit, quin his in rebus solis disciplina se contineret, cætera autem dicendi genera non solum negligeret, verum etiam excludere videretur. Historiarum expositio, philosophiæ explicatio, familiarium sermonum elegans imitatio disciplinam habebant nullam. Nam qui in his rebus elaborabant, aut a declamationum exercitatione aliquem usum dicendi afferbant, aut in eorum exempla, qui antea in his generibus excelluissent, intuebantur, aut suapte denique ingenio sensuque adjuti, quid verum et aptum esset, intelligebant. Itaque quum Aristoteles, eximii vir ingenii, ad explicandam illustrandamque artis rhetoriæ doctrinam accederet, hic quoque, priores sequutus magistros, neglectis reliquis dicendi generibus, orationum scribendarum artem et scientiam persequi satis habuit. Quamquam hic non ita viam ab illis patefactam tenuit, ut non et nova et subtiliter excogitata afferret. Naturam enim atque officium rhetoriæ, quod illi fere in flectendis commovendisque hominum animis versari statuebant, alio transferendum esse censuit. Nam quum rhetoricam, quam e dialectica oriri putabat, facultatem esse existimaret perspicendi quid in quaque re probabile esset, primariam ejus vim in probando demonstrandoque positam esse contendit. Alii deinde alias rhetoriæ definitiones attulerunt, ut facile possit aestimari, qualem esse oportuerit disciplinam artis de cujus natura non constaret. Quin ipse Quintilianus, in quo præclarum fuit atque eximia eruditione politum ingenium, in eo loco, in quo plurimas aliorum de fine rhetoriæ sententias commemorat et refellit, optimam ex his, quæ Isocratem habet auctorem, amplexus, rhetoricam bene dicendi artem esse existimat. Sed neque hæc definitio, neque illa Cleanthis et Chrysippi, rhetoricam recte dicendi artem esse censentium, quæ Quintiliano eandem habere vim atque illa Isocratis, nobis autem etiam propius verum accedere videtur, satis idonea est. Etenim, ut dicam quod sentio, omnes istæ artis rhetoriæ definitiones duplici maxime vitio laborant. Quippe ex una

parte justo latius patent, ex altera parte angustiores re definienda sunt. Ac latius patent primum eo, (3) quod dialecticæ aliquam partem admiscunt arti rhetoricæ, ut Aristotelica, reprehensa a Quinctiliano II. 15, 13. et a grammatico quodam in Biblioth. Coisl. p. 593. Neque enim hoc est artis ejus officium quæ dicendi præceptis continetur, ut, quid cogitandum sit et quomodo, ostendat, sed ut cogitata recte eloqui doceat. Deinde eo quoque latius quam debet extenditur rhetoricæ descriptio, quod a poesi non satis distingui solet. Nam definitiones, cujusmodi illæ sunt Isocratis et Chrysippi, quidni etiam in artem poeticam quadrent, quæ et bene et recte dicendi ars, non minus quam rhetorica, est? Nec meliores hoc in genere sunt illæ definitiones, quæ copiose ornatæque dicendi scientiam esse tradunt: in quibus hoc quoque vitiosum est, quod ne ad eam quidem, quæ universe vocatur eloquentia, accommodatæ sunt. Sæpe enim ea est maxima oratoris virtus, omnique copia et ornatu excellentior, breviter scire et simpliciter loqui. Contra, quod etiam angustiores, ac debebant, esse istas definitiones diximus, id spectat ad vim et usum artis, quem doctores omnes in orationibus quæ proprie dicuntur expromi putant. Nam quis tandem finis sit, quo hæ orationes ab aliis dicendi scribendique generibus ita differant, ut dictionem requirant plane singularem et ab aliis sermonum scriptionumque formis alienam? Manifestum est, quidquid hic discriminis reperiri possit, id non in dictione atque elocutione, quæ tamen propria est rhetoricæ, sed in materia dicendi argumentoque versari. Quare illi denique pene ridiculi sunt, qui eloquentiæ facultatem positam putant in rebus intelligentiæ communi accommodatis. Nam quæ tandem est illa communis intelligentia, aut quousque pertinet? quosnam quasi terminos habet, intra quos debeat consistere? aut quid est, quod ab hac intelligentia communi segregandum sit atque excludendum, quandoquidem gradibus quidem illa quibusdam distinguitur, sed circumscriptionem non habet aliam, quam quæ rerum omnium in cogitationem et sermonem cadentium circumscriptio est? Nam et rusticorum quædam est communis intelligentia, et mediocriter cultorum, et eruditorum, et philosophorum denique.

(4) Sed operæ pretium est quærere, quæ tantarum de artis rhetoricæ natura dissensionum causa fuerit atque origo. Eam vero non in ipso dicendi officio, quod sive bene sive recte sive apposite ad persuadendum dicendo continetur, simplex est neque ambiguum, sed in materia dicendi argumentoque positam existimaverim. Hoc enim quum artis doctores negligi non posse viderent, quia, qui recte dicere vellet, etiam rem, de qua diceret, apte tractare deberet, quærendum putarunt, quæ materia esset arti rhetoricæ subiecta. Atque quum alii, usum maxime atque exempla respicientes, eam artem in causis civilibus versari censisissent, alii, qui latius patere eloquentiæ vim animadverterent, quoniam infinitam esse materiæ copiam videbant, aut potissima tantum atque usu tritissime

argumenta disciplinæ quadam ratione consequuti sunt, aut definitionem materiæ talem posuerunt, quæ reprehensionem ambiguitate sua videretur effugere. Ita factum est, id quod pene est incredibile, ut etiam qui nullo in argumento non usum aliquem artis rhetoricæ esse putarent, non haberent tamen, quo pacto omnem illam materiæ argumentorumque vim una quadam certaue notione comprehenderent. Cui vitio si volumus occurrere, altius repetenda erit artis rhetoricæ definitio.

Atque quum omnis orationis duæ sint formæ, una, quæ poesis dicitur, altera, quæ prosæ orationis nomen habet, artem rhetoricam prosæ orationis condendæ scientiam esse iudicamus. Quæ definitio minus verendum est ne falsa, quam ne non satis clara esse videatur. Nam de eo quidem neminem a nobis dissensurum putamus, nullum esse dicendi genus, si a poesi discesseris, quin artis rhetoricæ præceptis indigeat, quandoquidem non solum eos, qui proprio nomine oratores vocantur, sed historicos, philosophos, epistolarum scriptores, omnino quoscunque prosa oratione utentes, arte quadam dicendi, diversa illa quidem in diversis generibus, sed simili tamen et ex uno quodam fonte derivata, opus habere videmus. Illud vero, in quo summa hujus disputationis versatur, differentiam dico prosæ et poeticæ orationis, obscurius est et majoribus obnoxium dubitationibus. (5) De quo si satis perspicue explicari poterit, non dubitamus fore, quin et illa, quam posuimus, rhetoricæ definitio plane intelligi queat, et ipsa hæc dicendi ars aptiorem quamdam et certiorē disciplinam sibi vindicatura sit. Sed non sum nescius, tam late patere hanc quæstionem de prosæ orationis et poeseos differentia, tantisque impeditam esse difficultatibus, ut, si quis penitus exhaurire hunc locum voluerit, ei vix magnum volumen sufficere videatur. Ac mihi quidem quum academicarum scriptionum brevitatem optionem fecisset, utrum singulas argumenti istius partes singulis datis opportunitatibus pertractare copiosius, an brevenem universæ disputationis adumbrationem uno vel duobus conjunctis libellis comprehendere vellem: consultius visum est, et ad perspicuitatem rei, præsertim antea non satis diligenter expositæ, accommodatius, totius argumenti quamdam quasi delineationem exhibere. Hanc vero disputationem in ita instituendam putamus, et Engelii, Sulzeri, aliorumque sententiis, qui ante nos in eodem argumento elaborarunt, præfatis, nova quadam ratione rem ab iis, quæ prima ejus elementa sunt, repetamus. Quod hoc minus vitio nobis speramus datum iri, quod, quum illi, utpote rei natura non plane perspecta, vix ad popularem captum satis apte discessisse videantur, haud facile quemquam fore existimamus, qui aut refelli illos postulet, aut ipse in illorum sententiis acquiescere velit.

Ac quæ duæ sunt omnis orationis partes, cogitationes et sermo, harum de utraque dicendum erit singulatim. Sed quoniam utraque harum partium ex his duobus constat, materia formaque, quarum

materiam dicimus, qua cogitationes et sermo id ipsum sunt, quod sunt, formam autem vocamus rationem, qua pro diversis finibus diversam vim induunt: apertum est, de forma cogitationum sermonisque, non de materia, nobis exponendum esse. Quam enim materiam cogitationum et sermonis nominamus, ea quia communis est omnis orationis, non habet, quod ad poesin et prosam orationem inter se distinguendâs adhiberi possit. Atque hujus generis duæ sunt doctrinæ, una, quæ cogitationum arte continetur, quam dialecticam vocant, altera, (6) quæ sermonis usum explicat, cui nomen grammaticæ est. Quod si quæ sunt, certe quod ad cogitationes attinet, diversitates materiæ, e quibus ad constituenda orationis genera aliquid momenti accedat, hæ quoque, quoniam eadem sunt in prosa oratione atque in poesi, merito hic quidem a nobis prætermittentur. Ac de his dixi in commentatione de tragica et epica poesi, quam Aristotelis libro de arte poetica addidi, cap. xiii — xvi.

Erit autem hæc de forma orationis, de qua sola dicendum nobis est, tripartita disputatio. Quæ enim duæ sunt orationis partes, cogitationes ac sermo, harum altera, sermonem dico, quia media est inter cogitationem loquentis et sensum audientis, duplici modo considerari debet. Nam quod dixi, mediam esse inter loquentis cogitationem et audientis sensum, id hujusmodi est. Vocabula, e quibus constat sermo, signa sunt, ad eum finem inventa, ut notitias animi et cogitationes declarent. Itaque primo loco in iis spectandum est, qua ratione quidque expriment, quæque vis eorum sit et significatio. Idque dictionem vocamus. Sed quoniam vocabulorum natura voce continetur, quæ pro sonorum diversis conformationibus diverso modo animum afficit ac movet, ea quoque, quæ vocis propria sunt, considerari oportebit. Id vero dicimus elocutionem. Itaque his tribus factis partibus, primo de cogitationum conformatione, deinde de dictionis forma, postremo de elocutionis ratione aperiemus.

### *De cogitationibus.*

Ac quoniam a cogitationibus, quæ primarium in omni oratione locum tenent, initium fieri par est, in his quæ prima est et maxima poeseos ac prosæ orationis differentia, eo censetur, quod notitias, in quibus exponendis sermo versatur, in prosa oratione ad aliquam rem extra nos positam, in poesi ad nosmet ipsos nostrumque sensum referimus. Est autem referre notitias ad res extra nos positas, cognoscere; ad nosmet ipsos, sentire. Itaque qui prosa oratione utuntur, cognosci aliquid ab auditoribus suis volunt; qui poesi, ad voluptatem orationem componunt. (7) Ac quemadmodum poesis, quæ nihil ad animi sensum voluptatemque afferret, non esset poesis: sic ne prosa quidem ea dici posset oratio, quæ nulli rei cognoscendæ inserviret. In poesi quidem res aperta est; obscurior paullo in prosa oratione. Nam hæc quoque, non secus ac



poesis, movere animum ac perturbare conatur. At tantum abest, hac in re ut aliquid mutuetur a poesi, ut magis, quantum ab ea differat, videatur ostendere. Nam quod paullo ante dicebamus, in prosa oratione notitias ad res extra nos positas referri, id vel maxime ibi licet cognoscere, ubi oratores aliquem animi motum, ut indignationem, miserationem, metum, in animis auditorum excitare student. Neque enim orator, ut poeta, iis rebus, quæ in quaque cogitatione expertes sunt claræ cognitionis, sed iis, quæ cognosci demonstrarique possunt, animos commovet. Docet ille, argumentisque ostendit, utile aliquid velnoxium, admirabile vel contemnendum, exoptandum vel fugiendum esse: quæ argumenta quia in vi rerum externarum ad animos hominum posita sunt, petit ea ab sensu cujusque, eumque ut commoveat, nunc eorum facit mentionem, quæ grata vel ingrata auditoribus esse debent, nunc se ipsum ita commotum iis ostendit, ut non possint non ad ejusdem perturbationis societatem abripi. Quare, ut brevi complectar, ubi orator animos commovere studet, hoc ei curandum est, ut studia auditorum ab iis rebus, in quibus ea versantur, ad eas res, de quibus orationem habet, transferat: id vero est facere, ut aliquis intelligat, cum iis rebus, quas magni faciat, quas expetat, quas metuat, quas oderit, alias esse conjunctas, quæ ejusdem curæ ac sollicitudinis communione requirant. Duobus hæc illustrare volo, sed iis sat luculentis exemplis. *O Spartace, quem enim te potius appellem? cujus propter nefaria scelera tolerabilis fuisse videtur Catilina.* Ἐγὼ μὲν δὴ ταῦτα λέγω, ταῦτα γράφω· καὶ οἶομαι καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἐπανορθωθῆναι ἂν τὰ πράγματα, τούτων γιγνομένων. εἰ δέ τις ἔχει τούτων τι βέλτιον, λεγέτω καὶ συμβουλευέτω. ὃ τι δ' ὑμῖν δοξεῖ, τοῦτ', ὃ πάντες θεοὶ, συνενέγκοι. Hæc quamvis magna cum vi atque animi commotione dicta sint, nihil tamen habent, quod poetæ potius, quam oratoris videri debeat. Omnia enim, (8) quæ in his verbis animum pellunt ac perturbant, ex ipsa rei cognitione nascuntur, quæ quia magnam partem cognitio est ejus, quod sperandum metuendumque sit, eo paratur, quod spem illam metumque in ipso oratore expressum et quasi præ-entem ante oculos collocatum videmus. Confidens eorum veritate, quæ antea dixerat, ταῦτα λέγω, ταῦτα γράφω, inquit. Necessitatem obsequendi, celeritatemque, qua ad eam rem opus sit, magnitudinem periculi, sollicitudinem denique, ne consilia sua cunctando irrita reddantur, ostendit iis, quæ sequuntur: καὶ οἶομαι καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἐπανορθωθῆναι ἂν τὰ πράγματα, τούτων γιγνομένων; et magis etiam additis his: εἰ δέ τις ἔχει τούτων τι βέλτιον, λεγέτω καὶ συμβουλευέτω. Postremo metuens, ne alia placeat sententia, non solum his verbis, ὅτι δ' ὑμῖν δοξεῖ, τοῦτο συνενέγκοι, vehementer se dubitare de felici alius consilii successu, sed his interpositis, ὃ πάντες θεοὶ, re plane desperata mentem et cogitationem ab imminentibus malis avertere demon-

Sed porro querendum est, si in prosa oratione notitiæ ad res

extra nos positas, in poesi ad nosmet ipsos referantur, quomodo hoc, et quibus mentis viribus, et per quas comprehensiones fiat. Facile enim intelligitur, tam diversa officia non solum diversis animi viribus peragi debere, sed genus quoque comprehensionum aliud esse, quo res externas, aliud, quo animi nostri statum percipimus. Atque illud quidem in promptu est, perceptiones mentis ad res externas per intellectum, et quæ hujus propriæ sunt notiones, referri. Quare cognoscendi negotium totum in notionibus inter se comparandis positum est. Quod si verum est illud, quod supra diximus, prosæ orationis naturam censi cognitione comparanda, non poterit illa non intellectum notionesque sibi proprias vindicare. Sed hoc quidem tam clarum est, ut dubitationem omnem excludat. Difficilior de poesi disputatio est. Poesis enim quum non ad rerum cognitionem, sed ad animi statum spectet, neque ad intellectum referri potest, neque in notionum tractatione et comparatione versabitur, quia in his nihil, quod ad animi sensum pertineat, reperitur. Nihil tamen minus poesin et easdem res tractare videmus, quas prosa oratione exponere licet, et notitiis uti iisdem, quibus in prosa quoque oratione locus est. (9) Quare illud quærere oportebit, qui fiat, ut rerum notitiæ ac perceptiones non ad res externas, sed ad animi sensum referri possint. Ea vero præclara est ac divina phantasie vis, quæ easdem animi perceptiones, quas intellectus per notiones ad res externas refert, per suas quasdam ideas (ita enim appellare liceat) ad excitandum animi sensum idoneas reddit. Sunt autem hæ, quas ideas phantasie vocamus, notationes quædam eorum, quæ in quaque re præter notionem ejus insunt: quæ si tam multa, tam magna, tam varia sunt, ut certa notio, quibus ea complectamur, inveniri nequeat, excitant hac materiæ copia et varietate animum, ut in iis comparandis judicandisque vires suas experiatur. Quæ virium animi exercitatio quia certis notionibus destituta est, nihil nisi sensum aliquem virium illarum procreare potest. Hæc quoque exemplis illustrare placet. Mnasalcæ epigramma est hoc:

Ἄσπις Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Φυλλέος ἱερὸν ἔδε  
 δῶρον Ἀπόλλωνι χρυσοκόμῃ δεδομαι,  
 γηραλέα μὲν ἔτν πολέμων ἦπο, γηραλέα δὲ  
 ὀμφαλόν· ἄλλ' ἔρετ' ἄλμπομαι, ἃς ἐνυχὸν  
 ἀνδρὶ κορυσσομένα σὺν ἀριστέϊ, ὅς μ' ἀνέθηκεν.  
 ἐμμὶ δ' ἀήσματος πάντων, ἀφ' οὗ γενόμενα.

Eo epigrammate quæ continentur, si quis prosa oratione complecti voluerit, habebit certis notionibus descriptam clipei istius cognitionem. Alexandri cujusdam fuisse sciet, consecratum esse Apollini, versatum fuisse in præliis, nunquam victum. Eadem tradit poeta, sed si sic, ut nunc relata sunt, poesis nulla foret. Hic ergo, ut placeat ista clipei descriptio, iis utitur notitiis, in quibus plurima sint, quæ lector amplius persequi cogitatione possit. Primo formam clipei propius ob oculos adducit his verbis; ἔτν et ὀμφα-

λόν, quo majori alacritate deinde reliqua, quæ commemorat, percipi possint atque animo comprehendendi. Tum *γηραλέαν* vocat, in quo verbo et cruoris, quo conspersus fuit clipeus, et sanctitatis quædam e vetustate oriundæ significatio est. (10) Deinde virtutem, quæ possessoris fuerat, clipeo tribuit, idque sic, ut ab luce, quæ ipsa est cum plurimis jucunditatis et magnificentiae cogitationibus conjuncta, ducat similitudinem. Denique possessorẽ describens, paucis verbis, sed magnam excellentium imaginum varietatem continentibus, virum lectori ostendit armorum splendore et corporis majestate conspicuum. Addam huic exemplo descriptionem lascivientis equi ex Homero, quæ bis in Iliade occurrit, semel, nisi fallor, posita ab antiquo poeta :

ὡς δ' ὅτε τις στατὸς ἵππος, ἀκοστήσας ἐπὶ φάτῃν,  
 δεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας θεῖει πεδίῳ κροαίνων,  
 εἰωθὼς λούεσθαι ἐνὶ ῥέειοι ποταμοῖο,  
 κυδιῶν· ἡψοῦ δὲ κάρη ἔχει, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαιῖται  
 ὁμοῖς αἰτσοῦνται, ὃ δ' ἀγλαΐῃφι πεποιθὼς,  
 ῥίμφα ἔ γούνα φέρει μετὰ τ' ἦθεα καὶ νομὸν ἵππων.

Nolo singula in his persequi: illud tantum notari velim, mentionem caudæ, quam equus vinculis ruptis ferociens sublatam gestare solet, a poeta, diligentissimo alias naturæ observatore omissam esse: in qua re curiosior fuit Plato in Phædro cap. 77. p. 254. D. Sed quid sit, quod in illa descriptione poesis sibi vindicet, optime poterit intelligi, si quis equi illius imaginem pictura expressam cum imagine equi tolutim, ita ut equiso docuit, incedentis comparare velit. Equus enim, qualem Homerus describit, erecto capite, fluctuante juba, luxuriante pedum glomeratione alacritatem, ferociam, terrorem spirat: alter iste, etiam si eximia sit pulcritudine, nihil nisi docet, quid sit gradus tolutilis.

Tertio loco de nexu cogitationum dicemus, cujus non potest non alia ratio in prosa oratione atque in poesi esse. Quum enim prosæ orationis proprium sit, perceptiones referre ad res externas, idque notionum auxilio, quas format et constituit intellectus: apertum est omnem naturam cognitionis, quæ hoc modo oritur, eo contineri, quod singularia per generalia comprehendimus atque intelligimus. Notiones enim comprehensiones sunt eorum, quæ plurium rerum communia sunt. (11) Itaque per notiones aliquid cognoscere, id est intelligere esse aliquid in earum rerum numero, in quas notio aliqua quadret. Contraria poeseos ratio est. Hæc quia perceptiones non ad res externas, sed ad sensum nostrum, nec per notiones, sed per ideas refert, a singularibus ad generalia adscendit, eaque singularium exemplorum auxilio ante mentem atque oculos adducere conatur. Idem enim, quæ poeseos omninoque pulcrarum artium propriæ sunt, quum comprehensiones sint eorum, quæ præter notionem rei in quaque perceptione insunt, non possunt comprehendere notionibus atque exprimi, sed indicari tantum debent, atque exemplis demonstrari, quo ani-

mus multitudinem illam varietatemque perceptionum amplius persequi, comparare, conjungere queat. In quo negotio ob id ipsum, quod certis notionibus destituitur, judicat varietatem illam pro ratione, qua ad ipsam judicandi facultatem apta sit atque accommodata. Eam vero judicandi rationem sensum pulchritudinis vocamus: qui propterea, quod ad plura pertinet, quam in cujusque rei notione insunt, generalium est per singularia perceptio. Tendit enim animus ad summum quoddam atque absolutissimum pulchritudinis exemplar, in idque intuens speciem quamdam deformare conatur, quæ id, quod nulla specie satis exprimi potest, quasi e longinquo monstret, mentemque propius spectandi avidam fugiendo alliciat. Sensit hoc, de quo nunc disputamus, prosæ orationis et poeseos discrimen Aristoteles, qui in artis poeticæ cap. ix. quum quæreret, poeta quid ab historico distaret, historicum singularia, poetam generalia tractare docuit. Ita is loquitur: ἡ μὲν γὰρ ποίησις μᾶλλον τὰ καθόλου, ἡ δ' ἱστορία τὰ καθ' ἕκαστον λέγει. ἔστι δὲ καθόλου μὲν, τῷ ποιῶ τὰ ποι' ἅττα συμβαίνει λέγειν ἢ πρίν τε κατὰ τὸ εἶκος ἢ τὸ ἀνάγκαιον· οὗ στοχάζεται ἡ ποίησις ὀνόματα ἐπιθεμένη· τὰ δὲ καθ' ἕκαστον, τί Ἀλκιβιάδης ἐπραξεν, ἢ τί ἐπαθεν. Quæ hic τὰ καθ' ἕκαστον dicit, ea sunt, quæ singularia vocamus. Est enim historici, ut prosæ oratione utentis, officium, de certa re sic exponere, ut generalibus usus notitiis cognitionem comparat lectoribus. Poeta vero, qui generalia curat, quæ τὰ καθόλου dicit Aristoteles, non id agit, ut rem cognoscant audientes, sed ut cognoscenda re majorem quamdam, (12) multoque latius patentem imaginem animo concipiant. Ut, si quis historicus ea narraret, de quibus in Iliade expositum est, Achillem acciperemus Pelei et Thetidis filium fuisse, virum in Græco exercitu fortissimum. Longe diversus Homeri Achilles est. Nihil curamus, utrum ille sit Achilles e Peleo et Thetide, an alius ex aliis natus; nihil utrum hos, qui tum ad Trojam militabant, virtute superaverit, an alios; nihil utrum ea, quæ fecisse eum poeta refert, fecerit, an alia: sed simulacrum eum habemus atque effigiem viri uobilitate generis, animi et corporis virtutibus, factorum magnitudine et claritate excellentioris, quam alii sunt. Ita Herodotus, cujus historia quasi viam ab epica narratione ad eam, quæ vere est historia, munivit, quum non solum cognitionem rerum gestarum, sed etiam vim ad animi sensum spectaverit, interdum ultra prosæ orationis terminos egreditur. Ut in ipso operis initio: Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησσοῦ ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις ἴδε· ὥς μήτε τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα γένηται, μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θυμαστά, τὰ μὲν Ἕλλησι, τὰ δὲ βαρβάροις ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀκλεᾶ γένηται. Et cap. v. τὸν δὲ οἶδα αὐτὸς πρῶτον ὑπάρξαντα ἀδίκων ἔργων ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, τοῦτον σημήνας, προβήσομαι ἐς τὸ πρόσω τοῦ λόγου, ὁμοίως σμικρὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἄσπεα ἀνθρώπων ἐπεξιών· τὰ γὰρ τοπάλαι μεγάλα ἦν, τὰ πολλὰ αὐτέων σμικρὰ γέγονε· τὰ δὲ ἐπ' ἐμεῦ ἦν μεγάλα, πρότερον ἦν σμικρὰ. τὴν ἀνθρωπότην ὧν ἐπιστάμενος εὐδαιμονίην οὐδαμᾶ ἐν τωτῷ

μένονσαν, ἐπιμνήσσομαι ἀμφοτέρων ὁμοίως. Sed redeo, unde digressus sum. Singularia per generalia intelligere est cognoscere, generalia singularibus indicata persequi est cogitando ludere. Itaque prosæ orationis propria cognitio est, poeseos animi lusus. Nexus notionum, quæ sunt in prosa oratione, definitur legibus iis, quæ ad cognitionem rerum pertinent, unde objectivæ a philosophis vocantur: iisque legibus constituitur veritas. Nexus idearum, quæ sunt in poesi, leges habet, quæ ad animi sensum spectant, quas leges subjectivas dicunt philosophi: per has vero pulcritudo efficitur. Itaque quæ in descriptionibus, in narrationibus, in demonstrationibus falsa sunt et veritati repugnantia, demonstrari argumentisque refelli possunt: (13) quæ vero ad pulcritudinem minus polita, vel etiam inepta sint, indicare licet, si alii idem sentiant, probari autem, si quis dissentiat, non potest. Afferam exempli causa epigramma Mnasalcæ, simile ei, quod supra commemoratum est.

Ἦδη τᾷδε μένω πολέμον δίχα, καλὸν ἄνακτος  
στέρνον ἐμῷ νῶτῳ πολλάκι ὀυσαμένα,  
καίπερ τηλεβόλους ἰούς, καὶ χερμάδι' αἰνὰ  
μυρία, καὶ δολιχὰς δεξαμένα κάμακας.  
οὐδέ ποτε Κλείτοιο λιπεῖν περιμάκκα πᾶχυν  
φαρὶ κατὰ βλοσυρὸν φλοῖσβον Ἐνναλίην.

Neminem puto fore, cui placeat καλὸν στέρνον viro bellatori tributum, præsertim quæm idem περιμάκκα πᾶχυν habuisse dicatur. Tamen quis neget, pulcrum pectus posse etiam tale intelligi, quale vel maxime virum valentem et robustum deceat? Nihilominus quis non persuasissimum sibi habeat, illud καλὸν non esse a manu Mnasalcæ profectum? Hic, nisi fallor, κάμνον scripserat.

Ab iis quæ hactenus disputata sunt, postremo ad eam deducimur cognitionum in prosa oratione et poesi differentiam, quæ in vi posita est, quam utrumque genus ad animum habet. Apertum est enim, cognitionis finem atque effectum persuasionem esse, lusu autem oblectationem gigni. Unde persuasio propria est prosæ orationis cujus artem qui scientiam accommodat ad persuadendum dicendi esse censent, definiunt rectissime. Poeseos autem est oblectatio, atque ars poetica continetur facultate apposite ad sensum pulcritudinis dicendi. Hæc quidem etsi satis per se clara sunt atque perspicua, paucis tamen exponendum videtur de persuasionem. Persuasum esse est credere convenire aliquam rem cum nostra ejus rei perceptione. Est autem hæc triplex convenientia, pro tribus illis viribus, quibus universa animi natura continetur: intelligendi facultatem dico, et sensum, et voluntatem. Ac res ad intelligendi facultatem ita referuntur, ut appareat, quales per se sint; ad sensum ita, ut intelligatur, quo effectum ad jucunditatem sint; ad voluntatem denique ita, ut mutua efficientiæ ratio inter res externas atque animum intercedens perspicatur. Itaque omnis orationis, quæ ad persuadendum spectat, (14) triplex officium, triplex forma est.

Etenim aut in simplici rerum externarum expositione versatur, ut historicorum, philosophorum, eorum, qui artes ac disciplinas tradunt: aut in animi affectionibus et motibus excitandis expromitur, ut in laudationibus, omnique illo genere dicendi, quod ἐπιδεικτικὸν Græci vocant: aut ad agendum denique et negotia hominum, studiis et cupiditatibus vel commovendis vel flectendis, refertur, ut in judiciali orationum genere, omninoque in admonitionibus atque adhortationibus. Ac facile intelligitur, primum genus ex his, quod ad solam rei, qualis per se est, cognitionem spectat, maxime omnium simplex ac planum esse. Secundum genus, quia vim declarare debet, quam aliqua res ad animi sensum habeat, concitatione quadam indiget. Pellendus enim et commovendus est animus, ut rem non tamquam ab se alienam consideret, sed aliquod momentum habere ad jucunditatem intelligat. Id igitur sic efficiendum est oratori, ut sive apertius sive tectius ea in mentem auditoribus revocet, quæ simul et cum re, de qua dicit, conjuncta esse, et ab auditoribus eo studio, quod pro causa sua commovere vult, accipi videat. In qua re illud efficacissimum est adjumentum, quod homines, uti alios animo affectos vident, ita ipsi iisdem motibus tangi perturbarique solent. In illo denique orationis genere, quod tertio loco numeravimus, quum non solum sensu aliquo afficiendi sint animi, sed studia etiam excitanda, cupiditatesque incendendæ, etiam major vis, motusque vehementior requiritur, quam in secundo genere. Neque enim satis est oratori, demonstrando efficere, ut eligere, quid faciant, auditores possint, sed deducere debet mentes eorum, unde velit, et, quo velit, compellere, atque omnino ita constrictas tenere, ut contraria consilia ne posse quidem sequi videantur. Itaque in hoc quidem genere maxima vis oratoris virtusque clucescit.

---

## NOTICE OF

1. *Introduction to the WRITING OF GREEK. For the use of the Junior Greek Class in the University of Glasgow. In four Parts. By D. K. SANDFORD, Esq., A.M., Oxon. Professor of Greek at Glasgow. Third edition, enlarged and improved. W. BLACKWOOD, Edinburgh; and T. CADELL, Strand, London.*
  2. *Rules and Exercises in HOMERIC and ATTIC GREEK: to which is added, a short System of Greek Prosody. For the use of the Second and Senior Greek Classes in the University of Glasgow. By D. K. SANDFORD, Esq., A.M.*
- 

THE author of this treatise, which may be regarded as supplementary to his *Introduction to the Writing of Greek*, in his preface, modestly hopes some original observation may be found in his work; but more boldly claims the credit of industry in amassing and digesting the remarks of other scholars. The critical reader will indeed find many traces of original investigation in these pages, which might well entitle them to the examination of others than those for whose use they were designed. Porson's philological discoveries pretend to be addressed to none but *adolescentes*, though the grey-headed Grecian found instruction in them; and something similar might certainly be said of the second part of this book in particular. But we wish to speak especially of the laudable care with which the numerous discoveries of modern scholars are presented to the learner in a tangible form. The knowledge of the Greek language generally possessed by students, is by no means proportionate in extent to the light actually existing in the works of Porson and Elmsley, and Herman, and other scholars. But the observations of these critics are widely scattered through their comments on different authors. The student picks up the information by degrees only and in fragments, as he advances through the field of Hellenic literature. Many never advance far enough to gather what is to be found; and some have not leisure or ability to digest into consistency the information thus acquired *carptim et vellicatim*. It must also be confessed, that in our schools the communication of knowledge does not always

keep pace with the discoveries of recent writers; a circumstance indeed very venial, when we consider the little leisure left to him who is laboring in the dust and heat of scholastic turmoil for examining the novelties of the teeming press of Germany, or the rarer productions of our own literati. The consequence of this is, that a great mass of knowledge really existing is of no use to any one but a few of the more distinguished students in our universities,

*Quis meliore luto fuxit prœcordia Titan.*

It has been buried in the depths of commentary, and the rising generation of school-boys often hears, without emendation or addition, the tale that was told to their grandsires before them. We must assign to Professor Sandford much credit for breaking in on this monotonous system. He has rendered accessible to all that which before was in a great measure written in vain, by presenting the approved decisions of modern scholars in the form of rules for composition. The condensation of useful hints and observations from the whole Philhellenic race is really admirable; and Professor Sandford merits the best thanks of every lover of the noble language which he so well illustrates, for having brought up criticism from the profundity of annotation and animadversion to dwell in schools.

The Rules and Exercises on Homeric and Attic Greek, which, as the standard dialects, form the proper ground for exercise, are divided into two parts; in the former of which the remarkable usages of the different parts of speech are distinctly exemplified; and in the latter, the forms of independent and connected propositions are illustrated with a logical accuracy, to which we have certainly seen nothing similar in any work of the kind produced in this country. We will give the reader an opportunity of estimating the discrimination with which the phrases for illustration are selected, by laying before him a specimen of the idioms on which rules are founded under the fourth head of the first part; i. e. the *Adjective*:

1. τὰ πίστ' ἐμαυτῷ τοῦ θράσους παρέξομαι.
2. ῥηίτεροι γὰρ μάλλον Ἀχαιοῖσιν δὴ ἔσσεθε  
κείνου τεθνηῶτος ἐναίεσμεν.
3. βούλομ' ἐγὼ λαὸν σὸν ἔμμεναι ἢ ἀπολέσθαι.
4. τὸ γὰρ νόσημα μεῖζον ἢ φέρειν.
5. ————— ἐλαφρότεροι πόδας εἶναι  
ἢ ἀφνειότεροι χρυσοῖό τε φεσθῆτός τε.
6. δυνατώτεροι αὐτοῖς αὐτῶν.
7. ἢ αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ τυγχάνει βέλτιστος ὢν.



## Numerals.

1. σύντρεῖς αἰνύμενος.
2. νῆες μιᾶς δέουσας τεσσαράκοντα.
3. τρίτον ἡμίδραχμον.

One of the excellencies of the work is, the accuracy with which the distinct usages of the Homeric and Attic dialects are marked in laying down the rules. For instance, the canon given for the substantive use of the infinitive stands thus: *With regard to the use of the infinitive as a noun-substantive, which may take place through all the cases, observe, 1. That the Homeric dialect does not couple the article with the infinitive in this sense; but that the Attic dialect does not dispense with the article, except sometimes in the nominative, rarely in the genitive, and sometimes in the accusative governed by a verb: 2. That not only the simple infinitive, but an accusative or a whole sentence with the infinitive, may be thus used, p. 75.* In conformity with this accuracy in the rules to each example, is attached the name of the dialect into which it is to be translated. The days are past in which it was absurdly imagined, that the language of Homer was a melange of many dialects, the creation of the poet, which never lived in daily use on the lips μεγάλων ἀνθρώπων, and was governed by no laws which a host of fancied figures and tropes might not at pleasure break through; but prior to the work before us we have observed no attempt, at least in this country, to familiarise the student with the structure of the beautiful language, which was spoken in Greece before the distinctions of Attic and Ionic were known. The name Homeric, by which scholars at present distinguish it, is an unfortunate one for those who are moved by names, as it still seems to invest Homer with a sort of sole proprietorship of the language which he used in common with the men of his own times. As the dialect of the ancient Ἀχαιοί, its true style and title would be *Achean*; and if our voice might prevail with the learned, so should it be designated.—In one or two instances, we regret to observe that Professor Sandford has accommodated his rule rather to that imitation of the Achean, the Alexandrine Epic, than to the native idiom of this ancient dialect.

P. 56. *As to the interchange of pronouns, observe that, in Homeric Greek ἐς is sometimes used for ἑμὲς or εὖς.* Perhaps the proof of this would rest solely on interpolated passages. We cannot avoid here expressing the pleasure with which we anticipate the increased knowledge of this interesting branch of Hellenic literature by the promised translation of Thiersch's Grammar.

Of the adverbial use of the adjectives expressive of time, such as *χθις*, *πεμπταιος*, &c. (see p. 81.) we should desire a few more examples to illustrate this very extensive phraseology. The use of *κνεφαϊος*, *ὀρφναϊος*, *κοιταιος*, and a whole tribe of this termination in reference to time has not been sufficiently remarked, and, apparently, not well understood. An attention to this might perhaps have produced something more apposite in the commentators on the 20th line of the *Agamemnon*. See, however, a good remark on the subject by the Bishop of Chester, *Matthiæ's Gram.* vol. i. p. xl. Perhaps it might have been well, either under this head or under the numerals, to remark on such usages of these adjectives, as occur in *Eurip. Hippolyt.* 275. and *Hecub.* 32. We may here also observe, that the note at the foot of p. 43, *superlatives as adverbs are usually in the plural, comparatives in the singular*, seems from its importance to require exemplification. It is, however, very ungracious to speak of omission, where so much has been done.

The second part of the exercises is arranged under the heads of, (1.) *Independent propositions*; and (2.) *Connected propositions*. Under the former head we have a series of rules on the expression of—the subject; the copula; the predicate; extension of the subject; combination of predicates or subjects; connexion of the several parts of the subject or of the predicate; ellipse and pleonasm. Under the second head we have the construction of supplemental propositions; transitive propositions; relative propositions; interrogatory sentences; the answer. This logical arrangement gives a degree of precision and clearness to the rules, to those for the construction of particles especially, which we do not remember to have seen attained before in the grammatical works of this country at least. To give the reader an idea of the method employed, we transcribe part of the rules from the division which treats of the copula: they run thus:—

- I. *When the copula is simply some part of σὺν not connected with the predicate, it may be omitted in expression; thus—*

\* [Here follow the examples.]

- II. *The copula is frequently expressed by κυρῶ or τυγχάνω.*  
*a. κυρῶ with a participle, poetic but not Homeric; thus, &c. or even without a participle, &c.*  
*b. τυγχάνω with a participle, conveying a notion of chance; thus, &c.*

To these rules are appended observations on the disputed question of the use of *τυγχάνω* without a participle, and on the

use of ἔχω in the copula with participles. On this last point we wish that Professor Sandford had warned the student to discriminate between the usage of ἔχω in union with a participle in which it still retains its possessive signification, and the usage by which it assumes the nature of the auxiliary verbs in the compound tenses of modern languages. In an examination of Homer, instituted for the purpose of ascertaining the antiquity of this latter usage, we were not able to detect a single genuine instance of it; and the example adduced by Professor Sandford from Hesiod seems fairly to belong to the marks which prove his juniority to the writer of the Iliad. Professor Mynas, indeed, (θεωρία περὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γραμματικῆς τε καὶ γλώσσης, Paris, 1827. p. 165.) endeavors to remove the distinction, of which we speak, altogether. After citing Soph. CEd. R. 700. οἶά μοι βεβουλευκῶς ἔχει, and Xenoph. Anab. lib. iv. ἐν οἷς τὰ ἐπιτήδεια εἶχον ἀνακεκομισμένοι, he observes, καίτοι οὐδὲ παρακειμένους, ἢ ὑπερσυντελικούς συνθέτους φήσειεν ἂν τις τὰς τοιαύδων φράσεις· δυνατόν γὰρ ἀναγινώσκειν, οἶά μοι ἔχει, βεβουλευκῶς, καὶ εἶχον τὰ ἐπιτήδεια, ἀνακεκομισμένοι. One of these resolutions might be admitted; the other, certainly not.

The rules on the expression of transitive propositions which denote design, p. 209—217, with the observations attached, form a very favorable specimen of the manner in which Professor Sandford has brought to bear on his subject, the accumulated research and ingenuity of critics and editors. The student who has employed this manual will be to a great degree released from the necessity of pausing momentarily in his reading, to examine as new to him the observations of annotators on grammatical forms on which ordinary grammars are silent. This is the desideratum: young men will seldom read to any useful extent, when they find themselves impeded by inaccurate notions of idiom at every step; and inaccurate their notions must necessarily be, while their preliminary knowledge is confined to such information as the usual elementary works afford.

We have yet to notice the treatise on prosody attached to the exercises. This embraces the rules of the Homeric hexameter, the tragic Iambic trimeter, and anapaestic dimeter, as well as rules for the quantity of the doubtful vowels in the last syllable; in the penultimate, before the penultimate, in the increment of nouns, in the increment of verbs, in derivatives and compounds. We shall not hesitate to say that on the departments of prosody, which it embraces, this is both the most comprehensive and the most accurate treatise which we have seen. The information is brought together from multitudinous sources; but

it is not therefore, according to frequent custom, thrown into a heap, but separated with the nicest order, and purified with the utmost care. In addition to the matter accumulated from preceding scholars, Professor Sandford has added much that is peculiarly his own, and exceedingly useful to the metrical student. For exactness of statement we would refer to the rules for the lengthening of short syllables by cæsura in Homeric verse, p. 265. For extensive research, we may enumerate the account given in the note p. 280, of the usage of the tragic writers in respect to the tribrach in the fifth place; the statement in the note p. 282, respecting the concurrence of trisyllabic feet; the list of epic forms used by Sophocles, p. 286; the catalogue of passages in which occurs the aphæresis of  $\epsilon$  in note p. 299. Most useful also and complete are the examples of crasis and synizesis given in p. 302—308. On the subject of the epic forms in tragedy, Professor Sandford's remark at p. 286, *that Monk, Valckenaer, and other commentators, have nothing more full or satisfactory than the observation of Porson, Praef. ad Hecub., leads us to remind him of a useful note of Lobeck ad Soph. Aj. 427. and another on 186.—We cannot agree with the Professor in his conjecture, p. 309 (note), on the reason of the hiatus in Œd. R. 959.*

Εὖ ἴσθ' ἐκείνων θανάσιμον βεβηκότα.

Perhaps from the frequent juxtaposition of the two words εὖ and ἴσθι, they might occasionally in respect to metre be treated as a compound. This idea receives additional probability from the circumstance of the adverb σαφῶς being united to εὖ ἴσθι in this passage. See Schafer's note ad loc. It is on the same principle that we would account for some singular instances of hiatus in the fragments of the later comic writers.—The observation, p. 311, that all the editions retain παλαιὸν in Eurip. Elect. 500, is not precisely correct. Mr. Robinson in his edition (Cambridge, 1822,) has given πολὺν with the following note: *Πολὺν est emendatio Scaligeri, cum in vulgatis esset παλαιόν. Scaligeri πολὺν autem probat Musgravius, cui assentiuntur Porsonus et Marklandus. Pierson ad Mær. p. 353, praefert πολιοῦ.* Professor Sandford has cited Elmsley's note on the remarkable prosody in Eur. Heracl. 995. It might, perhaps, have been worth while to give the extension of it from the addenda: *Archilochus apud Stobæum, CXI. p. 580. 'Ενάλιον, καὶ σφιν θαλάσσης ἤχηντα κύματα. Simonides Amorginus apud eundem, LXXII. p. 435. Τὴν δ' ἵππος ἀβρὴ χαιτήεσσ' ἐγείνατο.* We are inclined to think that the licence used by these writers was not so entirely unknown to Homer, as Pro-

fessor Sandford, with strong reason we admit, supposes. See p. 267. For although we look with great suspicion on the instances of a shortened vowel or diphthong before a *short* syllable in the same word; such as Od. xx. 379.

*Εμπαιον οὐδὲ βίης, ἀλλ' αὐτως ἄχθος ἀρούρης·*

there are other passages which we would not hastily give up. Il. I. 169. may be easily altered, but not so Od. xxii. 289.

*Μῦθον ἐπιτρέψαι· ἐπεὶ πολὺ φέρτεροί εἰσι·*

The tables of words making the doubtful vowels long, given at p. 384, &c. constitute a peculiar excellence of the work, being both more copious and more accurate than any in use. The notes and references interspersed and attached at the foot of the pages are calculated to satisfy all doubts. We, however, dissent from the account adopted at p. 334 from Maltby of the quantity of *φάος*, according to its different meanings. The notice of *φαέα* in the sense of days is, we suppose, inadvertently omitted; but there is indeed no necessity for marking these differences at all: *φάος* has the *α* short by nature both in the singular and the plural, in whatever sense it may be used. The examples of a different quantity may all be explained by the rule given, p. 260, for words of three short syllables. Under *δπαρινός* are some useful observations on the quantity of adjectives of time in *ινός*. It appears to us that the rules given by all prosodians on this subject should be cleared of several needless exceptions. In the passage of Callimachus, cited as having *μεσαμβρινός* with the penult long, there can surely be little doubt that the poet wrote *μεσαμερία*. We have not the Bishop of Chester's edition at hand for reference; but if we recollect right, he has adopted this reading. Again the passages of the Anthologia, which are sometimes cited to prove that *εθρινός* is occasionally used with a short penult, are, we doubt not, corrupt; the true reading in all being *οθρινός*. See Museum Criticum, vol. ii. p. 315. This, however, is a conjecture to which Dr. Maltby himself led the way in his note on *δπαρινός*, p. 623. We may be allowed to remark, that mention should have been made of such proper names as *Μναστίνος*, *Φιλίνος*, &c. which we constantly hear mispronounced. The word *Τελλίνη* might also have been noticed with advantage, as being a term still retained in conchology. Mus. Crit. ii. p. 315.

We must now take leave of Professor Sandford, with our best thanks for the services which he has rendered the cause of Hellenic literature in this volume. Many genuine scholars are too much inclined to sit inactive on the heights of learning, and in

the satisfactory consciousness of their own acquirements καθορᾶν τὴν τῶν ἄλλων πλάνην, καὶ τὰ ἐκείνων ἐπιτηδεύματα, ὥς οὐδὲν ὕγιές δρῶσιν. It may be, according to the Lucretian idea, *a goodly sight to see*; but it must be so only to him, *who hath no friend, no brother there*: and as we feel some interest in the literary advancement of our Philhellenic youth, we are happy to find that so accomplished a scholar disdains not the province of instructing.

---

## ORIGINATION OF THE GREEK CASES, &c.

---

*To the Editor of the Classical Journal.*

SIR,

A Correspondent (No. XXXII. p. 326.) reminds your readers, that Mr. Tate, several years ago, promised to give the learned world his hypothesis of the origin of the Greek cases, and that apparently he has never redeemed that engagement.

Mr. Tate herewith incloses for insertion in your pages, if you think good, part of an article which appeared in the *British Critic* for April, 1826; and which, by the Editor's kind permission, he is at liberty to reprint in any way that he pleases.

This extract will probably convince your Correspondent that Mr. Tate had not quite forgotten that promise of his; while the delay to publish his original Essay has enabled him ultimately to exhibit, in a briefer but more satisfactory form, his ideas on that interesting subject.

29th Feb. 1828.

R. S. Y.

---

The first race of *Persians* and *Indians*, to whom we may add the *Romans* and *Greeks*, the *Goths* and the old *Egyptians* or *Ethiops*, originally spoke the same language.

The *Jews* and *Arabs*, the *Assyrians* or second *Persian* race, the people who spoke *Syriac*, and a numerous tribe of *Abyssinians*, used one primitive dialect wholly distinct from it.—SIR WILLIAM JONES, 1792.

---

AFTER thus placing Mr. *Homer's Greek Grammar* fairly in the sight of our readers, we hasten to indulge a speculation of our own. To advance the landmarks of science in that language, and not merely to cultivate what is already inclosed, may be forgiven as an object of just ambition, if it should fail in the attempt to be realised. Every thing, then, which learning and research might

## 98      *Origination of the Greek Cases, &c.*

effect within the limits of the Greek tongue itself, we verily believe, is nearly, if not altogether, exhausted. A vast field, however, yet remains for the exploring eye in a more ancient language; which demonstrably is mother, or very like it, both to the Latin and Greek.

The great resemblance of Sanscrit words to those of Greek and Latin, Mr. Hallied was the first to detect: and though he made his discovery known to oriental scholars, so long ago as the year 1778, it does not appear that he ever pursued the investigation of that similitude himself, or inspired any kindred mind with zeal in the cause.

Even Sir William Jones, who corroborated, in 1786, Mr. Hallied's judgment on the beauties of the Sanscrit, and on its wonderful coincidences with the Greek and Latin, never seems to have practically traced the Asiatic tongue in a line with the European, or to have thrown the light of his fine intellect on the birth and parentage of the latter.

The first opening of this interesting task in detail, was reserved for the acute and ingenious writer (Edinburgh Review, No. xxvi. for January, 1809,) of an article on *Wilkins's Grammar of the Sanskrita Language*. He professed to run the parallel only with the Latin, having but a slender knowledge of the Greek; and his demonstration of the identity of numerous *words* in the languages, as well as of their *structure* also, has been considered perfectly successful. Singularly enough that writer, without being aware of it, was quite lucky in beginning with the Latin; which, being either the child or the sister of Æolic Greek, in the very same degree more faithfully preserves the flexions of the Sanscrit. The deviations of the Ionic and Attic from the Æolic forms, of course present a very curious subject for disquisition.

One or two specimens may suffice, at present, to show the nature of this remark. Every scholar knows, that in the small remains of Æolic composition, verbs in  $\mu$ , so called, occur very strikingly. Now, the Sanscrit employs the very same elements (*mi*) in constituting the first person of its verb: its pronoun separately is *aham*, while the Teutonic is *ich*, and the common Greek is  $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ . Hence  $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\mu\iota$  the Æolic differs from  $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\omega$  the common form; with the Sanscrit *Pà mi*, I reign, it evidently agrees. Again, the elements *s* and *tha* mark the second persons singular and plural in Sanscrit: the peculiar endings of  $\omicron\iota\sigma\theta\alpha$  from  $\omicron\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha$ , &c. always called Æolic, and of the Latin, *novisti* and *nostis*, &c. exhibit the same identical pronoun.

With all our obligations, however, to the writer in the Edinburgh Review, we have to acknowledge a far deeper and more extensive work on the very same argument. The title is full of promise; and the execution, as far as we have seen of it, abundantly makes good the expectation held out.

In the *Annals of Oriental Literature*, (Part i. June, 1820,) the very first article, (pp. 1—65.) is this:—

*Analytical Comparison of the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Teutonic Languages, showing the original identity of their grammatical structure.* By F. Bopp.

This *Analytical Comparison*, justly so called, (but never continued beyond the first number,) embraces the *verbs* and *participles* only. It is admirable as far as it goes; but dwelling perhaps too long in detail, its effect is rather lost in the multitude of small particulars. The reader new to such a subject, (and who is not?) requires to be refreshed every now and then by stopping at short stages where he may be invited to recapitulate and review what is already done.

We could have wished also, for reasons which will appear by and by, that the author had proceeded in the same acute manner to illustrate the similitude of the *nouns* and *pronouns* in Sanscrit and Greek. He deserves our best thanks, however, for the light which he has so far thrown on the *comparative anatomy* of those tongues; and we shall be most happy to profit, when we know where and how, by the continuance of his labors in a field of such curious and instructive discovery.

For the present, let us frankly and briefly confess what is one definite object at least of these suggested inquiries. We are devotedly attached to the language and literature of Athens: our old friend Dr. Parr, the Nestor of Greece, was hardly more so. And it struck us at an early period of life, that the whole *rationale* of Greek syntax hinged, and must of necessity hinge, on the analysis and signification, when discovered, of the several Greek cases.

Here, we still think, lies the Gordian knot of Grammar. It has been distantly touched—it has been clumsily cut: has it ever yet been fairly untied and developed? To speak plainly, then, we want to know the constituent parts of a Greek case so called. Shall we look for “metaphysical aid,” and investigate in the genitive, dative, and accusative cases, “the three chief circumstances of relation or connexion in human life, *possession*, *interchange*, and *action*?” That has been done with the most pleasing ingenuity (sixty years ago) by Professor Moor of Glasgow, in his *Introductory Essay on the Greek Prepositions*.

If dissatisfied with abstract and logical bases for this grammatical structure, shall we venture to fix a “*local habitation*” for the *name*? May we not then suppose, that since of all relations the first and most striking are those of sensible objects, the *material* world in this, as in other departments, lent its language to the *moral*? Or, to declare at once what we honestly believe, let our own hypothesis, under that modest name, be avowed without farther excuse or apology.

The Greek NOMINATIVE case, then, was the noun itself, not



## 100 *Origination of the Greek Cases, &c.*

in its *crude state*, (according to the phrase of Sanscrit grammar,) but combined with the simple pronoun, *he*, *she*, or *it*.

The GENITIVE case was the noun so formed, with a word besides, or part of a word, indicating the local term *of*, or *from* :

The DATIVE, in like manner, with some indication of *in*, or *at* :

And the ACCUSATIVE, with some final syllable signifying *to*.

This scheme for the primitive formation of the cases, (drawn up in a brief essay five-and-twenty years ago, and communicated to a few eminent scholars, but never printed,) if taken as a whole, and particularly in the simple elements so distinctly stated, we believe to be entirely original. That in parts, some approaches have been made to it, though much too loosely to touch the matter to the quick, must be candidly acknowledged ; and may, indeed, be fairly urged, as preluding to its discovery, and now favoring its truth, in the very same degree. We do not intend at present to bring forward in detail the grammatical facts which support this hypothesis : but the nature of the argument will be seen in a few specimens.

In the parisyllabic declensions, then,  $\gamma\eta$  and  $\sigma\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ , compared with  $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta$ , sufficiently show the pronouns, *he* and *she*, in the NOMINATIVE.  $\omicron\upsilon\pi\alpha\nu\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\nu$ , an old form of the GENITIVE, with  $\omicron\upsilon\pi\alpha\nu\acute{o}\theta\iota$ , (from  $\omicron\upsilon\pi\alpha\nu\acute{o}\sigma\iota$ .) for the DATIVE, may serve to illustrate those cases as part of the system. And as old forms of the ACCUSATIVE, let  $\pi\epsilon\delta\iota\sigma\iota\delta\epsilon$ ,  $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\delta\epsilon$ ,  $\chi\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon$ ,  $\omicron\upsilon\pi\alpha\nu\acute{o}\sigma\epsilon$ , be produced to complete the set.

On attempting to carry this idea into the third or imparisyllabic declension, we had to encounter an evident change in the pronoun concerned, and found the difficulties increase accordingly. Yet in that declension, supposing, as we do, the local term ( $\iota\nu$  or  $\iota$ ) to be the original ending *always* of the dative case, and knowing the forms  $\epsilon\varsigma$  and  $\alpha\varsigma$  in Greek (with *as* in Sanscrit) to indicate plurality, we could not but discern a strong agreement with our wishes, in the dative plural of  $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\omega\nu$  for instance :—

N.  $\kappa\upsilon\nu$ — $\epsilon\varsigma$ , dogs :

D.  $\kappa\upsilon\nu$ — $\epsilon\sigma$ — $\iota\nu$ , *in* dogs :

prolonged into  $\kappa\upsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota\nu$ , or shortened into  $\kappa\nu\alpha\iota$ .

Our main strength, however, lies, till the Sanscrit be farther examined, in the singular agreement betwixt the prepositions of the Greek language and the cases which go along with them. Thus : the prepositions  $\alpha\pi\acute{o}$  and  $\epsilon\acute{\xi}$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ , and  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , are the constant companions of the genitive, dative, and accusative, respectively. This, we say, is exactly as it ought to be for our hypothesis: nothing could possibly answer it better.

Again, whenever a preposition is of a nature to go with three different cases, if the local relations, *from* or *of*, *in* or *at*, and *to*, can be clearly seen, the cases also are seen with those very distinctions. We have been amused, indeed, to remark how very nearly some ingenious men have caught at once the master-key

to the causes of Greek syntax from correctly translating the following sentence in the *Anabasis* of Xenophon:—

Ταῦτα εἶπεν· οἱ δὲ στρατιῶται οἱ τε αὐτοῦ ἐκείνον, καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι, ταῦτα ἀκούσαντες, ὅτι οὐ φαίη παρὰ Βασιλέα πορεύεσθαι, ἐπήνεσαν· παρὰ δὲ Ξενίου καὶ Πασίωνος πλείους ἢ δισχίλιοι, λαβόντες τὰ ὕπλα καὶ τὰ σκευοφόρα, ἐστρατοπεδεύσαντο παρὰ Κλεάρχῳ.

Of course the translation below (need we stop to prove that *παρὰ* is the English word, *side*?) is intended to exemplify analytically our theory of the cases:

παρὰ Ξενίου,                      παρὰ Κλεάρχῳ,                      παρὰ Βασιλέα,  
from-side-Xenias, at-side-Clearchus, to-side-the-King.

Herman, in his acute, profound, invaluable essay *De Ellipsi et Pleonasmō*, (1808, Berlin; 1813, Oxford,) by the light of that very preposition, strikes out the general meaning of the cases, but without breathing a hint of their material origin.—(pp. 135=164.)

“*Παρὰ est apud*, eaque significatio manet, sive *παρὰ σοί*, sive *παρὰ σέ*, sive *παρὰ σοῦ* dicatur: sed casuum diversitas facit, ut *παρὰ σοι* habeatur id, quod est apud te; *παρὰ σέ*, quod accedat ad te; *παρὰ σοῦ*, quod veniat a te: id quod simili modo Galli dicunt, *de chez toi*.”

Let us now hope that we have succeeded in showing, by specimen, at least, the deep and essential connexion of the Greek cases, rightly analysed, with the principles of Greek syntax. We have rendered it probable, also, that certain terms of local meaning exist in the combination of elements which form the Greek cases. Exactly to develop the constituent parts of the noun in all three declensions, if we must speak the truth honestly, is quite out of our power. Whether that task be itself possible, we dare not pronounce. But if the Greek language be immediately derived from the Sanscrit, which we believe on the authorities quoted in an earlier part of this article, to the Sanscrit some critical master of both languages must go—

“*I pede fausto, Docte sermones utriusque linguæ!*”

and, from the comparative anatomy of the two, elicit the structure of the less perfect, which at present stands in much need of illustration.

By way of postscript, and as an encouragement to our hopes, we copy from Wilkins's *Grammar*, (pp. 36, 37,) the following account of the eight cases in Sanscrit:—

1. The *nominative*.    2. The *accusative*.    8. The *vocative*.
3. The *implementive* case, having the force of the sign *by* or *with*.
4. The proper *dative* case, with the sign *to*.
5. The *ablative* case, with the sign *from*.
6. The proper *genitive* or *possessive* case, with the sign *of* or *belonging to*.

7. The *locative* case, with the sign *in* or *on*.

“ Quis referet nobis victor, quid possit oriri,  
 Quid nequeat ; finita potestas denique quoique  
 Quanam sit ratione atque alte terminus hærens ? ”

R. S. Y.

## THE THEOLOGY OF THE PRIMITIVE GREEKS.

THE *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, acquiring no little interest from their antiquity, and deriving a high poetical worth from the vigor of conception, and the simple propriety and force of expression which they invariably exhibit, are yet more valuable, as furnishing a history of the transactions to which they have reference, and as affording plentiful, though scattered information, relative to the state of opinion and practice in those early times. The fidelity of Homer, as an historical poet, we shall not here investigate at large ; two remarks will suffice.—First, it is undeniable that as far as regards the substance of historical facts, mentioned as having occurred at or about the time of the Trojan war, these two great Homeric poems either discountenance or openly repudiate the fabulous accounts current in later periods. And secondly, it was necessary for the bard, in the primitive times of Greece, to relate the debates of Olympus, and specify the proceedings of the imaginary deities, to confirm his countrymen in the opinion that he was assisted by a particular goddess ; an opinion to which he was indebted for much of his honor and distinction. These two remarks combined, especially if displayed in all their various bearings, form an unanswerable argument in favor of the veracity of Homer, as respects the substance of the accounts he gives, of what were to him recent transactions. But this is not the only, or the most important deduction, from these considerations ; in conjunction with internal evidence of the most formidable nature, they invest likewise the information which Homer supplies on the antiquities of primitive Greece, with an authority commanding and decisive.

The theology of the primitive Greeks is a subject highly interesting in itself, and one, a thorough knowledge of which is necessary to a proper comprehension of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* : their religious notions, affecting and communicating a peculiar character to almost every transaction. Their deities were a

race of *superior immortal men*. That they were possessed of *bodies*, must be evident to every one who has perused a single book of either of the Homeric poems. Repeatedly is mention made of the faces, hands, arms, feet, &c. of the several imagined divinities; and the connexion of these expressions forbids us to interpret them otherwise than literally. Nay, we even find Minerva continually celebrated for the penetration of her eye, Juno for the fairness of her arms, whilst Jupiter is distinguished as possessing a majestic dignity of countenance. And as they had bodies, so they had bodily wants and requisitions; sleep was thought necessary to recruit their wasted strength, and a constant supply of provision was indispensable to their comfortable existence: though, it is true, their corporal powers were greater than those of the human race,—their corporal functions were more ably discharged, and they were capable of enduring fatigue, and of sustaining the want of sleep and provisions, to a far greater extent than mankind. And even their superiority in these respects arose, as also did the immortality of their bodies, from the sustenance they partook of—ambrosia and nectar: if reduced to the food of mortals, their divinity was at an end; and if destitute of nourishment for a long space of time, death ensued. These positions are strongly supported; innumerable are the passages which may be adduced in confirmation of them; but we shall confine ourselves to two:

ῥέε δ' ἄμβροτον αἶμα θεοῖο,  
Ἰχῶρ, ὅς περ τε ῥέει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν.  
Οὐ γὰρ σίτον ἔδουσ', οὐ πίνουσ' αἰθοπα οἶνον.  
Τοῦνεκ' ἀναιμόνες εἰσι, καὶ ἀθάνατοι καλέονται.

Il. E. vss. 339 sqq.

Τλῆ μὲν Ἀρης, ὅτε μιν Ὠτος, κρατερός τ' Ἐφιάλτης,  
Παῖδες Ἀλωῆος, δῆσαν κρατερῶ ἐνὶ δεσμῶ.  
Χαλκίῳ δ' ἐν κεράμῳ δέδετο τρισκαίδεκα μῆνας.  
Καὶ νῦν κεν ἐνὸς ἀπόλοιτο Ἀρης, ἄτος πολέμοιο, κ. τ. λ.

Il. E. vss. 385 sqq.

As it regards the *intellectual faculties* of the supposed deities, they were also a superior race of human beings. Endued with different tastes, possessed of different degrees of ability, and of capacities formed for different pursuits, all were imperfect in reference to the extent of their knowledge and comprehension, though with respect to their particular branches of knowledge, each was thought to have attained the highest degree of proficiency.

Their *moral properties and conduct* have little of excellence. Tainted with all the corruptions of the unregenerate human

heart, they constantly acted from the impulse of their passions. Desirous of honor, they were conceived to treat with the greatest severity those who dared to neglect or improperly perform the due ceremonial observances, and rewarded with riches and prosperity the man who was most zealous in their service. Their interest led them to revenge acts of flagrant injustice in men, whilst they indulged in their own breasts the most implacable anger towards a person, in consequence of a deed justifiable and proper, and committed adulteries of the most base and disgraceful character.

If we view the gods as a *community*, we find that all the others were governed by Jupiter as sovereign. He was superior to them all in personal strength and wisdom; and from him did they receive their several departments of action, offices, and privileges; to him did they utter their complaints; by him could they be punished; and no project of importance appears to have been undertaken by any of them, without his concurrence or permission; all things, in short, relating to the community, were at his disposal, and determined by his irrevocable nod; and the exercise of his power was restricted only by a fear of rebellion. In their intercourse with each other, the gods displayed all the hurtful passions which reigned within them. Diversity of sentiment occasioned angry altercations: these were accompanied by invective and abuse; and on some occasions manual encounters were resorted to. Such were the beings to whom, in the primitive times of Greece, divine honors were paid; viewed in whatever light, the creatures of a depraved heart and a darkened imagination.

All these deities were thought to interest themselves, each to a certain extent, in the concerns of mankind. The Homeric Greeks held the doctrine of *divine providence* in its utmost latitude, as respects the objects which it embraced. They not only believed in a general providence, which kept the world in being and directed the affairs of states, but likewise in a particular providence, which superintended the concerns of every individual: nor did they, in reference to these, make a distinction in favor of important, momentous transactions, but extended the providential care of the gods to circumstances which, comparatively speaking, are trivial and insignificant. Every paragraph of Homer's writings substantiates these observations. Thus far their ideas of divine providence accord with the declarations of the Christian Scriptures: widely different is the case, as regards the view they took of the design of the gods in their dispensations. Heathenish divinities, sensual and corrupt in

themselves, could only be actuated by sensual motives, or impelled by disgraceful propensities. And thus, although, generally speaking, prosperity was considered the reward of piety,—the ceremonial piety of those times,—and adversity the punishment of impiety, or some daring violation of justice; there were distressful occurrences which were attributed to the capricious malevolence of a deity or deities. Moreover, so numerous were the gods, and so differently were they affected towards individuals, that the most constant and scrupulous observance of appointed rites was insufficient to insure them success in their lawful enterprises, or freedom from trouble and suffering, if by any mischance they had incurred the displeasure of one of the misnamed heavenly beings. The effect of these sentiments on the conduct of those who were guided by them towards others, was in some small degree salutary, as they deterred them from such improprieties of action, as, it was conceived, might draw down on them divine vengeance; but viewed as stimulants to action, and as encouragements to rectitude of practice, how lamentably deficient, how miserably poor do they appear! By some, the doctrine of divine providence was converted into that of divine *compulsion*; in some cases, it may seem, to serve political purposes. Thus Agamemnon says,

Ἀλλὰ μοι αἰγίοχος Κρονίδης Ζεὺς ἄλγε' ἔδωκεν,  
 "Ὅς με μετ' ἀπρήκτους ἔριδας καὶ νείκεα βάλλει.  
 Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼν Ἀχιλεὺς τε μαχυσάμεθ' εἵνεκα κούρης, κ. τ. λ.

Il. B. 375 sqq.

ἐγὼ δ' οὐκ αἰτίός εἰμι,  
 Ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς, καὶ Μοῖρα, καὶ ἡεροφῶιτις Ἐρινός,  
 Οἳ τέ μοι εἰν ἀγορῇ φρεσὶν ἐμβαλον ἄγριον ἄτην.

Il. T. 86—88.

We have good reason to conclude, however, that this was far from being generally the case.

There must always subsist an intimate connexion between the opinions entertained of the attributes of the deity or deities, and the ideas of a future state of existence: so it is with the Christian scheme, and so with the creed of every heathen nation and every heathen philosopher. On this great subject, indeed, notions in every respect proper and becoming, can only be derived from an express revelation of the designs of Omnipotence, as even from premises the most correct our deductions must be vague and imperfect; but independently of revelation, in proportion as our views of the attributes of deity approach to perfection, and as our reasonings on the matter are legitimate,

so will our ideas of future being correspond to fact. Agreeably to these principles, we can expect but little of correctness or propriety in the opinions of the primitive Greeks on this important particular. As their imagined gods were influenced, like corrupt man, by selfish motives, in the distribution of blessings, and the infliction of punishment, the present existence was chosen by them for the display of their judgments; inasmuch as here their conduct would be generally apparent, and as here only they could be honored with sacrifices and oblations, the honor in which they delighted. And as, with very few exceptions, the good-will and the malevolence of the divinities did not extend beyond the present life, so they entirely deserted disembodied spirits, and left them to a state of melancholy inactivity and negative infelicity, though not in one sense positive wretchedness. The soul was conceived to be enveloped, after death, with a peculiar atmospheric body, similar in appearance to the body of the person whilst living, but imperceptible to the touch; on which account it is properly termed a shade. The soul was in this state susceptible of all the emotions of which it was the subject on earth; but as it was in itself depraved, and as there very rarely occurred anything to excite pleasurable feelings, its almost universal condition was a kind of melancholy dejectedness. To confirm this statement, we have only to refer the reader to the eleventh book of the *Odyssey*: one remarkable passage, commencing with part of the address of Ulysses to Achilles, we may be allowed to extract:

σεῖο δ', Ἀχιλλεῦ,  
 Οὐτίς ἀνὴρ προπάροιθε μακάρτερος, οὔτ' ἄρ' ὀπίσσω·  
 Πρὶν γὰρ σε ζῶν ἐτίομεν, ἴσα θεοῖσιν,  
 Ἀργεῖοι, νῦν αὖτε μέγα κρατέεις νεκύεσσιν,  
 Ἐνθάδ' ἑών· τῷ μῆτι θανῶν ἀκαχίζεις, Ἀχιλλεῦ.  
 Ὡς ἐφάμην· ὁ δέ μ' αὐτίκ' ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπε·  
 Μὴ δὴ μοι θανάτῳ γε παραύδα, φαίδιμ' Ὀδυσσεῦ·  
 Βουλοίμην κ' ἐπάρουρος ἔην θητευέμεν ἄλλω  
 Ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἀκλήρῳ, ᾧ μὴ βίोटος πολὺς εἴη,  
 ἥ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν.

For a few highly-favored individuals, related generally to some of the most powerful deities by birth or marriage, a fertile and enchanting spot, near the ends of the earth, (for this earth was conceived by the primitive Greeks to be a circular superficies,) was supposed to exist. It was termed "the Elysian plain;" to it, it was imagined, such as were privileged to be partakers of the delights it afforded, were translated without dying. Others

were even exalted to divine honors and enjoyments. See *Od.* *Δ.* 561 sqq. *Δ.* 601 sqq.

How poor must have been the effect of these notions in encouraging to the practice of virtue, or deterring from the perpetration of crime! how little of support could be derived from them by the most virtuous, in the article of leaving every thing that had animated or charmed!

Taking a general view of the theological system of early Greece as we find it delineated in the Homeric writings, the only conclusion to which we can come, is, that as a theory it is despicable; as affecting practice, though some few particulars were calculated to produce in this respect beneficial effects, it had much that was negatively bad, much positively injurious. We certainly do consider that Dr. Gillies, however excellent are many of his observations on the antiquities of the primitive Greeks, takes a very partial survey of his subject, when he mentions, (*History of Greece*, chap. 2.) "the amiable simplicity of their religious system;" and says, "it would require a volume completely to illustrate the salutary effects of this ancient and venerable superstition, which was distinguished above most other false religions by the uncommon merit of doing much good, without seemingly occasioning any considerable harm to society."

Though we look to tradition as the source whence the early Greeks derived their sacrificial system, and the *rudiments* of their theology; yet we regard observation and their various civil and domestic institutions, as giving to it the character it possesses in the works of Homer. The bards appear to have had a principal share in the undertaking; their interest and desire of glory prompting them to a spirited exertion of the capabilities and influence they enjoyed. To specify, where we have no data to guide, cannot, in an article of this kind, and one written chiefly for the student, be attended with beneficial results: on a subject so complicated and obscure as the present, it may be better to trace an outline with probability, than to enter into a minute conjectural detail.

Ξ. Φ.





## A CRITICAL DISSERTATION

*On Romans, viii. 28—31., showing that the Passage is altogether incapable of its usual acceptance; and comprising a Philological Investigation of the Scripture Terms, commonly rendered, The Called, Predestination, Foreknowledge, &c.*

THE verses which are the subject of the following dissertation, are as follows in the Greek original:

Vs. 28. Οἶδαμεν δὲ, ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπᾶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν.

29. Ὅτι οὗς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισε συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνης τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς.

30. Οὗς δὲ προώρισε, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσε· καὶ οὗς ἐκάλεσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· οὗς δὲ ἐδικαίωσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασε.

31. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα; Εἰ ὁ Θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τίς καθ' ἡμῶν;

Our authorised version translates:

28. "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose:

29. "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren.

30. "Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.

31. "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us?"

These verses, it should seem, in connexion with Ephesians, i. 4—6: iii. 11, more particularly suggested the sentiments and phraseology of the seventeenth article of the Church of England: "Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honor. Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be

made like the image of his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ : they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity," &c.

And it may be considered, that the passage which it is here proposed to investigate, is the most weighty and important of all that have been adduced in support of the Calvinian doctrine of Predestination; inasmuch as it appears expressly to acknowledge that doctrine, and to invest it with the authority of a plain scriptural affirmation. Accordingly it must be held of the highest importance to ascertain its true meaning; and every peculiarity in its verbal construction is deserving of the most impartial consideration.

The first particular we shall notice, and which cannot fail, we conceive, to arrest the attention of every careful reader, is, that in the 28th verse, St. Paul uses the present tense, ἀγαπῶσι "to them that love;" συνεργεῖ "work together;" κλητοῖς οὖσιν "are the called;" that in the 29th and 30th, he changes to the aorist, προέγνω "did foreknow;" προώρισε "did predestinate;" ἐκάλεσε "called;" ἐδικαίωσε "justified;" ἐδόξασε "glorified;" and that in the 31st and 32nd, his observations again refer to the present time. Now the aorist has reference solely to *distinct past occurrences*, never to any *general present procedure*. It follows, that the 29th and 30th verses have not, cannot have respect to what was when the Apostle wrote, and is now, the procedure of the Almighty in reference to the salvation of mankind. From this conclusion, undeniable both as it regards the truth of the premises and the propriety of the inference, we advance to one of a more general nature. As St. Paul in the 28th verse, advances an assertion relative to the present time, digresses in the two following to past occurrences, introducing what he says by οὔτι; and in the 31st draws a conclusion in reference to the present, and a conclusion very similar in its import to the assertion contained in the 28th, it must be, that in the 29th and 30th verses he alludes to such past events as would illustrate or confirm the declaration advanced in the verse preceding, and would warrant the conclusion contained in the following one. It surely cannot be maintained, that those two verses are designed to illustrate and explain the last part of the preceding verse, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν, this being inconsistent with the difference of tense. What then is the declaration? τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν. And the conclusion is, Εἰ ὁ Θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τίς καθ' ἡμῶν; which the subsequent verse proves to have respect to the dispensations of Divine Providence; "Οσγε τοῦ

ἰδίου Υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν· πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίσεται; “He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not also with him be favorable to us in all things?” not as in the common translation, “how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?” Consequently, the providential care of God over those who love him, must be illustrated in the two verses spoken of, or the reasoning of St. Paul must be chargeable with the grossest inaccuracy. On these general deductions it is, that the explanation we are about to give of the passage is grounded.

In examining the passage more minutely, the first thing that requires consideration is the clause, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν, rendered in our version, “to them who are the called according to *his* purpose :” the word “his” being in italics, to denote that it was inserted by the translator to supply an ellipsis in the original, inconsistent with the English idiom. The verbal adjective κλητὸς is formed from the verb καλέω, usually “to call to any one, or to any thing;” also “to style,” “name,” &c. To produce instances of these acceptations from the New Testament is altogether unnecessary, as nearly every chapter furnishes us with examples of both. This verb admits likewise of the meaning “to consider,” “esteem,” “acknowledge :” a meaning more rarely assigned to it, it is true, but still supported by authorities, and which can by a simple modification be traced to the radical signification, the verb almost literally corresponding to the English “call.” So Matthew, v. 19. Ὃς ἐὰν οὖν λύσῃ μίαν τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων, καὶ διδάξῃ οὕτω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἐλάχιστος κληθήσεται, (shall be considered, or esteemed,) ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· ὃς δ' ἂν ποιήσῃ καὶ διδάξῃ, οὗτος μέγας κληθήσεται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν. So likewise Romans ix. 25, 26; 1 John iii. 1. Most interpreters and critics refer the verbal adjective κλητὸς, and the substantive term κλητοί, or οἱ κλητοί, to the first of the above meanings of the verb, translating them, “called” or “invited,” “the called” or “invited.” From an examination, however, of the passages in which the expressions occur, we have been led to consider them as receiving the third acceptation of καλέω, “considered,” “esteemed,” “acknowledged,” “the considered,” &c. In many cases they are to be translated, “professed,” “the professed,” to render the phraseology more agreeable to the idiom of the English language. In Romans i. 1., as also 1 Corinthians i. 1., St. Paul styles himself, κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, which is rendered in our authorised version,

“called to be an apostle.” Highly as we respect the common translation, as being incomparable for its general accuracy, we do maintain that in this case the Greek words are not susceptible of the meaning assigned them, and strenuously contend for the superior propriety of “an acknowledged apostle.” The idea of “constitute,” or “make,” is scarcely reconcilable with the primary notion conveyed by the verb. It is well observed by Dr. Adam Clarke, in reference to the verse in Romans; “As it is likely that no Apostle had been employed in founding the Church of Rome, there was need of much *authority* to settle the matters that were there in dispute.” No other canonical epistles, besides that to the Romans, and the first to the Corinthians, are introduced by the expression in reference to the writer, κλητὸς ἀπόστολος.—In 1 Corinthians i. 2. St. Paul addresses himself, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, κλητοῖς ἀγίοις κ. τ. λ. Now it is evident from the contents of the epistle, that the church at Corinth was not entirely composed of true Christians; that there were some among the professors, who in experience and practice were devoid of the essentials of true Christianity. Every individual member, however, had avowed his belief in the truth of the Christian system, either renouncing at the same time the deities and observances of Heathenism, or receiving Christ as the object of the Jewish dispensation; and in virtue of this avowal, had acquired a new character, which would amply justify St. Paul in styling the body of professors collectively “the church of God,” “sanctified (or “set apart”) in Christ Jesus.” Under these circumstances, what designation could be more appropriate, than “esteemed or considered saints,” or rather, agreeably to the idiom of the English language, “professed saints.” These remarks are equally applicable to Rom. i. 7. If we turn to Matt. xx. 16. xxii. 14. where the word κλητοὶ occurs substantively, we find our sentiments in this particular most strongly corroborated. Πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσι κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί, cannot mean any thing else than, “many are the professed, but few the accepted.” The word under consideration can aptly bear the meaning we have assigned to it, in Rom. i. 6. and 1 Cor. i. 24. In this last, be it observed, St. Paul is speaking of what Christ was regarded, not experienced to be. The last passage to be referred to, is, Jude 1. Ἰούδας, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου, τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ Πατρὶ ἡγιασμένοις, καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς: which our version renders, “Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified

by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, *and* called." How much more proper the translation, "steadfast professors of Jesus Christ!" From these observations, which comprise nearly the whole of the passages of the New Testament, in which the expressions under review occur, the intelligent classical reader will be able to decide on their meaning. We presume that the weight of argument preponderates on the side of the interpretation we advocate, "esteemed," or "the esteemed," "considered," "acknowledged," or "professed." The word *πρόθεσις* is derived from *προτίθημι*, "I set before;" in the middle, "I set before myself," "design," "resolve;" and accordingly *πρόθεσις* is "a design," or "determination;" in short, "a purpose." So Acts xi. 23. *παρεκάλει πάντας, τῇ προθέσει τῆς καρδίας προσμένειν τῷ Κυρίῳ*, "he exhorted them all, that with purpose (or "determination") of heart they would cleave unto the Lord:" Acts xxvi. 13. *ὑποπνεύσαντος δὲ Νότου, δόξαντες τῆς προθέσεως κεκρατηκέναι, κ. τ. λ.* "And when the south wind blew softly, supposing that they had obtained their purpose," (or "design") &c. See also, Rom. ix. 11. Eph. i. 11. iii. 11. 2 Tim. i. 9. The terms having been explained, it remains to fix the meaning of the clause, *τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν*. In order to this, we observe, that *κατὰ πρόθεσιν* cannot with any consistency be understood of any purpose of God. Had the apostle said, *τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθὸν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν αὐτοῦ κλητοῖς οὖσιν*, the common translation would have been obviously correct as far as respects the application of *πρόθεσιν*; or had he even employed the phraseology, *κατὰ τὴν πρόθεσιν*, although the absence of the pronoun would have been felt, still it would have been evident that some grand purpose of the Almighty was here intended. But the simple expression *κατὰ πρόθεσιν* being stationed between the article and substantive, the fact is ascertained beyond the possibility of a doubt, that that expression qualifies the substantive which follows it, and that the real signification of the clause is, "to those who are determined (or "decided") in their profession." To remove the scruple of the philologist relative to the construction of *κατὰ* in this rendering, we need only refer to Heb. xi. 13. *Κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες, κ. τ. λ.* 1 Peter iii. 7. *συννοικοῦντες κατὰ γνῶσιν κ. τ. λ.*

We now come to the word *προέγνω*, "did foreknow;" the meaning of which, as being of the highest importance to that of the whole passage, we shall endeavor to scrutinise with accuracy. To ascertain the exact signification of the verb *προγινώσκω*, and the substantive formed from it, *πρόγνωσις*, it is neces-

sary to have clear ideas respecting the preposition *πρὸ*, both in its simple state and in composition. To omit the acceptance, “in behalf of,” *πρὸ* in its simple state has a three-fold meaning; *before*, in reference to local situation; *previous to*, in reference to time; and *in the sight of*, in reference to publicity; all comprehended in its correspondent in English, *before*. Now it is understood that a preposition in composition, affixes to the term to which it is joined, more or less strikingly in different cases, the idea which it conveys in its simple state. This is the fact with *πρὸ* in each of its three significations.

In some words, as in *προτίθημι* already mentioned, it means “*before*,” in respect of locality; in others, alluding to time, it affixes to the simple term the adverb “*before-hand*,” as in *προμαρτύρομαι*, 1 Pet. i. 11. *προλέγω*, 2 Cor. xiii. 2, &c.: whilst in other compounded words, it intimates *publicity*, although this last particular appears to have been in a great measure neglected, especially by the translators of the New Testament. To establish ourselves in the position we have now taken, and prove that in the Greek of the New Testament, *πρὸ* in composition is in some words to be translated “*openly*,” “*publicly*,” we appeal to the following passages: 1 Cor. xi. 21. Ἐκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προκαταλαμβάνει ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν, καὶ ὃς μὲν πεινᾷ, ὃς δὲ μεθύει: rendered by our translators, “For in eating, every one taketh before *other* his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken.” Here the word *προκαταλαμβάνει* indubitably signifies, “taketh openly.” 2 Cor. xii. 21. xiii. 2. Μὴ πάλιν ἐλθόντα . . . καὶ πενήσω πολλοὺς τῶν προσημαρτηκότων, καὶ μὴ μετανοήσαντων ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ ἀσελγείᾳ, ἧ ἔπραξαν. Περσεύοντα . . . τοῖς προσημαρτηκόσι καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν, ὅτι ἐὰν ἔλθω εἰς τὸ πάλιν, οὐ φείσομαι. In the former of these passages, the common version reads, “I shall bewail many who have sinned already, and have not repented,” &c.; and in the latter, “to them which heretofore have sinned, and to all other, that, if I come again, I will not spare.” But nothing can be more evident than that *προσημαρτάνω* here means, “to sin openly.” Galat. vi. 1. Ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν καὶ προληφθῇ ἄνθρωπος ἐν τινὶ παραπτώματι, κ. τ. λ. “If a man be overtaken (or “taken openly”) in a fault.” Ephes. i. 12. Εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἑπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, τοὺς προηλπικότας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ. This is translated in the authorised version, “That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ.” Were it asked whom the apostle designates, “we who first trusted in Christ,” no satis-

factory reply could be given; and this fact speaks loudly in favor of the interpretation we contend for, "who have openly believed in Christ." In the epistle of Jude, ver. 7, it is said of Sodom and Gomorrah, *πρόκεινται δεῖγμα*, an expression which is properly rendered in our translation, "are set forth for an example." It is from the neglect of this usage, that the etymological meaning of the word *πρόφημι* has been made to contradict its actual meaning; *φημι* signifies "to speak," and being associated with *πρό*, the compound is used in the sense "to speak openly" or "publicly." We have enlarged on this point, inasmuch as it is a point of the highest moment in reference to the meaning of the word under consideration; a point, the non-observance of which has occasioned many errors, and which, if properly attended to, may lead to results of the utmost consequence to Biblical criticism.—It has been usual to refer the preposition in the compound words *προγινώσκω*, *πρόγνωσις*, to time, and accordingly to translate them, "to know beforehand," or "foreknow;" "knowledge beforehand," or "foreknowledge." On the contrary, we do maintain that in these terms *πρό* has the third of the acceptations above noticed: that the former of them means, "to know openly;" and that the latter is nearly equivalent to the English, "connivance" or "permission." Again, the word *γινώσκω* not only expresses a knowledge of any thing, but is likewise employed to point out an intimate connexion and friendship subsisting between two parties; as in the gospel by St. John, x. 14, 15. xvii. 3. Thus likewise the word *προγινώσκω* sometimes means, "to have publicly an intimate connexion with any one," "openly to favor in a peculiar manner;" and thus, too, the noun expresses, "peculiar favor openly manifested." That the idea of publicity is suggested by the preposition in these terms, will be evident from the subjoined examination of all the passages of the New Testament in which they occur. The first is, Acts ii. 23. *Τοῦτον τῇ ᾠρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκδοτον λαβόντες, διὰ χειρῶν ἀνόμων προσπύξαντες ἀνείλετε*: rendered in the common version, "illumi, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." To say, that God *knew* of the death of Christ *beforehand*, after saying that he had definitely fixed it, is (we speak it with reverence) altogether superfluous. But to say, that God had definitely appointed the death of Christ, and that he permitted the Jews to seize him, is an assertion both forcible and appropriate. We next meet with Acts xxvi. 5. a passage directly in favor of our sentiments: *Προγινώσκοντές με ἄνωθεν, ἐὰν θέλωσι μαρτυρεῖν, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν τῆς ἡμετέρας*

θησκείας ἔζησα Φαρισαῖος. How ridiculous here would be the translation, "Who foreknew me from the beginning, that after the strictest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee!" What the apostle asserts, is, that his Pharisaic principles and observances were publicly known among the Jews; and it cannot be questioned, that προγινώσκω means in this verse "to know openly."

In Romans, xi. 2. we have, Οὐκ ἀπόσωτο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, ὃν προέγνω: in our version, "God hath not cast away his people, which he foreknew." The verb evidently means, "openly favored in a peculiar manner," "publicly owned as his peculiar people;" an expression well suited to the state of the Israelites under the Levitical dispensation. We must next attend to 1 Pet. i. 1, 2. Πέτρος, ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμιοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, . . . Κατὰ πρόγνωσιν Θεοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐν ἀγιασμῷ Πνεύματος, εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: thus translated in the present authorised version; "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, . . . Elect, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." That the second verse is to be referred to the characters mentioned in the first, ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμιοις, κ. τ. λ. is undeniable; but this fact is insufficient to warrant us in connecting, as in the vulgar rendering, ἐκλεκτοῖς simply, with κατὰ πρόγνωσιν, κ. τ. λ. And we believe that the second verse should rather be interpreted, "according" to the peculiar favor of God the Father (openly manifested), by the purification of the Spirit, through the obedience and sprinkled blood of Jesus Christ." The expression ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος we conceive to be equivalent to αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ, Heb. xii. 24; in like manner as we have οἱ ἄρτοι τῆς παρουσίας, Matt. xii. 4. Mark ii. 26. and ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων, Heb. ix. 2. "the show-bread." But not to enlarge on the exact meaning of the passage, it will suffice for our purpose to observe, that from the things with which it is associated, it is far more probable that the word πρόγνωσιν in this passage refers to the "peculiar favor," than to the "foreknowledge" of God. The only remaining instance of either of the terms in question, is, 1 Pet. i. 19, 20. Ἀλλὰ τιμῶ αἷματι, ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου, Χριστοῦ. Προγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς. Instead of the "fore-ordained" of the common translation, we should here render the term in dispute "known openly," or even simply "known;" the idea of publicity though existing, not being in this instance



sufficiently prominent to authorise the introduction of the English "openly."

After this review of all the passages of the New Testament, in which *προγινώσκω* and its kindred noun are to be found, we appeal with confidence to the critical reader, as to the comparative excellence of the interpretations we have advanced, and that one which has been usually adopted, being fully convinced that the result of an impartial inquiry cannot be detrimental to the cause we advocate. Agreeably to what has been said, we translate, in the passage which forms the subject of this dissertation, "*Ὅτι οὗς προέγνω*," "seeing whom he publicly favored in a peculiar manner." In support of this translation, we could mention the doctrine of divine prescience; and argue, that if it is true that God knows beforehand every thing and every person, there must be an impropriety in saying *οὗς προέγνω*: an expression which cannot, without violence to the original, be qualified in any respect to designate a peculiarity in the character of certain individuals; but we abstain from doctrinals, as much as possible, in a work professedly philological.

Our attention must now be turned to the word *προώρισε*, translated "did predestinate." Besides this passage, *προορίζω* occurs, Acts iv. 28. 1 Cor. ii. 7. Eph. i. 5. 11. It is a verb, compounded of *πρὸ* and *ὀρίζω*, the preposition having the meaning of *beforehand*; and the simple verb, which is derived from *ὅρος* "a boundary," signifying "to define," "appoint." We may therefore properly translate it, "to pre-appoint," or "appoint beforehand;" as the term does not involve the notion of necessity, implied by the English "predestinate."

The next particular is, to ascertain what is meant by *προώρισε συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς*. The word *εἰκὼν* occurs, Rom. i. 23. 1 Cor. xv. 49. 2 Cor. iii. 18. Coloss. iii. 10. Heb. x. 1. Rev. xiii. 14, 15; in all of which passages it manifestly signifies "*the figure*," or "*form*." The words *συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος* cannot then be understood literally, as no one could resemble the "*form*" of Christ. To us it appears that St Paul alludes to the similarity of features observable in the several children of some parents, and applies the figurative expression he has used to some eminent characters under the Jewish dispensation, and that termed the patriarchal, who were in some respects the types of our Saviour. We accordingly translate, "seeing whom he publicly favored in a peculiar manner, and appointed beforehand conformed (or "*the conformed*") to the figure of his Son, so that he might be, *as it were*, the first-born among many brethren." The

phrase "appointed beforehand conformed," cannot but sound harsh to the English ear; it is, however, a literal translation of the original, and must be used in order to convey the exact signification. Our authorised version has, "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate *to be* conformed," to answer to the Greek, *Ὅτι οὕς πρόεγνω, καὶ προώρισε συμμόρφους*. This is in the highest degree inconsistent: it not only overlooks the remarkable difference between the phraseology of this part of the 29th verse and that of the 30th, *Ὁὕς δὲ προώρισε, τούτους, καὶ ἐκάλεσε, κ. τ. λ.* but the interpretation is such as the Greek words cannot, without force, be made to receive.

The only objection to the rendering we have given, must be drawn from the repetition, *οὕς δὲ προώρισε*; but the objection which this fact may suggest, however specious, has not the least validity. St. Paul having digressed in introducing the figure just explained, reverts to his argument briefly; and as he wished to show particularly, in illustration and support of what he had advanced in the 28th verse, that the Almighty calls those who love him, by his providence, to undertake what he has designed them to perform, he says, "But whom (or simply "whom:") he had pre-appointed, them he also called:" not thinking it necessary for his purpose to repeat "whom he publicly favored, in a peculiar manner, and appointed beforehand." That it is quite proper to refer *ἐκάλεσε* to a call from Providence to sustain the character, which was sustained by the persons referred to, is abundantly evident from what has already been said regarding that verb: *καὶ οὕς ἐκάλεσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν*: "and whom he called, them he also vindicated." The verb *δικαίω* often means, "to vindicate" or "justify," as in Luke xvi. 15. The apostle asserts here, that God vindicated the character of the persons to whom he refers, as it regarded the capacity in which he called them to act. With respect to *οὕς δὲ ἐδικαίωσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασε*, it may be observed, that the verb *δοξάζω* is, in the New Testament, understood in a twofold manner, signifying both "to honor," "ascribe glory to," and "to make honorable." We question whether it has ever respect to the reward, which will in a future state be conferred on the righteous. The above words must be understood, that those whose characters God vindicated in the peculiar sphere in which he called them to move, he also made honorable in their peculiar sphere of action.

Thus explained, the 29th and 30th verses are consistent with the context: St. Paul argues from past historical occurrences universally credited among those to whom he was writing, in

support of an assertion concerning the state of things at the present; from those appointments of Providence, the design of which were obvious, to all the dealings of God; and from the case of the most eminent servants of the Almighty in former dispensations, to that of true believers in Jesus Christ.

## ON THE HOMERIC DIGAMMA.

### PART II.—[Continued from No. LXXII.]

12. MOREOVER, that the same word, at the same epoch, might be pronounced with or without the digamma, according to the exigencies of metre,—as *ῥεῖπον* or *εἶπον*, *ῥέργον* or *ἐργον*,—we learn from the analogy of words, which, in like manner, retain or reject some other initial consonant. Thus,

**K** in *κίων*, *ῖών*: as, *λέχουσε κίων*, Il. Γ. 447, and in other places, but *Αἴαντος ῖών*, Il. Α. 138, &c.: the latter forms (*ῖών*, *ἰοῦσα*, *ῖοιεν*, &c.) are found in about 200 places, the former (*κίων*, *κιοῦσα*, *κίομεν*, *κίοιτε*, &c.) in about 50.

**Δ** in *λείβω*, *εἴβω*: as, *Δῖα λείβειν*, Il. Ζ. 266, &c. but *δάκρυον εἴβει*, Il. Τ. 323, &c.: in *λαίψηρός*, *αἰψηρός*: as, *μέρος λαίψηρά τε γούνα*, Il. Χ. 204, &c. but *παύομαι αἰψηρός δὲ κόρος κρυεροῖο γούνο*, Od. Δ. 103. Compare Il. Τ. 276, &c.

**Μ** in *μία*, *ῖα*: as, *τῷ δὲ μῆς περὶ νῆος ἔχον πόνον*, Il. Ο. 416, &c. but *τῆς μὲν ἱὲς σιγῆς ἤρχε*, Il. Π. 173, &c. as the necessity of metre may demand. The form *ῖα* is even occasionally found employed merely to avoid the repetition of *μ*, as *ἐν δὲ ἱῇ* (read *τ' ἱῇ*) *τιμῇ ἡμὲν κακός*,<sup>1</sup> Il. Ι. 319; just as, without necessity, the *φ*, which represents digamma in the word *φῆ*, is often dropped, since this is always *ῆ* at the beginning of a verse.

**Γ** in *γαῖα*, *αἶα*: as, *ἐστοναχίζετο γαῖα*, Il. Β. 95, &c. but *φυγίζοος αἶα*, Il. Γ. 243, &c.

13. Since, then, *κίων*, *κίομεν*, *λείβω*, *λαίψηρός*, *μῆς*, *γαῖα*, *γαίης*, *γαῖαν*, &c., according to the exigencies of the metre, might also be pronounced as *ῖών*, *ῖομεν*, *εἴβω*, *αἰψηρός*, *ἱὲς*, *αἶα*, *αἶης*, *αἶαν*, &c. it need not seem extraordinary that digammated words should, on

<sup>1</sup> Such is the reading of the old editions, of the Leipzig Ms., and of Ernesti. Bentley, to remedy the hiatus, proposed *ἐν δὲ γ' ἱῇ*, or *ἐν δὲ φίσῃ*: of which readings the first is opposed to the laws of the Homeric language, and the second to the laws of Homeric metre. It seems better to restore, with Payne Knight, the form *μῆ*, and thus deprive Thiersch of his example, than to insert the unnecessary conjunction, as proposed in the text.—D. K. S.

the same principle, sometimes throw away the digamma; especially since, in their case, the mutability of the letter, its suppression after apostrophic, and its entire extinction in later times, come in aid of such a supposition. Thus we may allow, in one series of examples, the collocations ἁλλὰ Φάναξ, ἁλλὰ Φάνασσα, Ταλαϊνίδαο Φάνακτος, &c.; and in another series, γὰρ ἄνακτος, μὲν ἄναξ, ἥς περ ἄνασσε, θυμὸν ἄνακτος, &c.: in one place φάρμακα Φειδῶς, and in another, εἶγε μὲν εἰδεῖς; in one place ἄνδρα Φέαστον, and in another, θυμὸν ἐκάστω; and so Φέπος or ἔπος, Φέργον or ἔργον, &c.

14. That which has been here admitted on the grounds of analogy and induction, namely, that the digamma may stand or fall, according to the exigencies of metre, is demonstrated—(not to mention again γέντο, i. e. *γέντο* or *φέτο*, which is found in some places, while *εἴλετο* appears in others)—in the word *ἐρίγδουπος*, i. e. *ἐριφδουπος*, which becomes *ἐρίδουπος* when the syllable requires to be shortened: thus, *ἐριγδούποιο*, Il. E. 672, &c. *ἐριγδουπος πόσις* "Ἠρης, Il. II. 411, &c. but *ἀκτάων ἐριδούπων*, Il. Υ. 50. *αἰθούσης ἐριδούπου*, Il. Ω. 323, &c. It is demonstrated also in *ῆ* "as," which is *φή*, i. e. *φή*, in Il. B. 144., since on that line (*κινήθη δ' ἄγορῃ*), ὡς κύματα μακρὰ θαλάσσης) the Scholiast remarks that Zenodotus wrote *φή κύματα*; and thus too at Il. Ξ. 499.—ὁ δὲ *φή*, κώδειαν ἀνασχών, | πέφραδέ τε Τρώεσσι, καὶ εὐχόμενος ἔπος ἤυδα.<sup>1</sup> Zenodotus gives ὁ δέ, *φή* κώδειαν ἀνασχών, | πέφραδέ κ. τ. λ. Here Homeric usage forces us to abandon *φή* for *ἔφη*, and the rules of versification force us to retain the consonant in *φή*, unless, with Aristarchus, in spite of sense and connexion, we give up the verse altogether<sup>2</sup> from an uncritical horror of the word *φή* or *φή*.

15. Lastly, in furtherance of our proofs, we may cite also those forms, which, as we shall presently see, had the digamma in the middle of the word, and yet dropped it as the verse might require: thus, *εὐκῆλος* i. e. *ἔφκῆλος* and *ἐκῆλος*, αὐτὰρ i. e. *ἄφτὰρ* and *ἄτὰρ*, Ἀτρεΐδαο i. e. Ἀτρεΐδαφο and Ἀτρεΐδew, ἀλευασθαι and ἀλέασθαι, &c.; as, in Latin, both *amaverunt* and *amarunt* (*amaerunt*), *paraverunt* and *pararunt*, *audiverant* and *audierant*, were in use at the same time.

## VIII.

*Of the results of the foregoing investigations with regard to the treatment of the Homeric text.*

1. We may, in the first place, admit as correct the list of di-

<sup>1</sup> Doubtless from manuscripts. It may be observed, by the way, that Homeric criticism would gain much in clearness and certainty, if more attention were paid to Zenodotus, and to his important and remarkable readings of the poet's text, than to the often partial and pedantic Aristarchus.

<sup>2</sup> Payne Knight follows Aristarchus here, as in too many of his rejections. D. K. S.

gammated words in Homer which Heyne has given in an *Excursus* on the Iliad, book T. (vol. vii. pp. 708—772.) leaving it to future research to ascertain whether one or two words may not yet be added to that catalogue; and, this done, we may,

- a. in the treatment of the text, prefer those readings, which are conformable to the use of the digamma, since it is more probable that this letter might have been dropped by grammarians and transcribers ignorant of its claims, than that the poet should, without metrical necessity, abandon it.
- b. If the digamma cannot recover its right by critical aid without appealing to *conjecture*, then the place should be left undisturbed, since it is doubtful whether it has been corrupted by the alterations of grammarians, or rejects the digamma in obedience to the will of the poet. It is only in this way that, without giving up the doctrine of the digamma, the Homeric text can be preserved from perpetual and flagrant violations.

2. With greater confidence may we, before digammated words, throw away the paragogic *ν*, write *οὐ* instead of *οιχ*, and dismiss those particles, which have been inserted instead of the digamma, evidently from ignorance, to fill up the verse. Thus, *ἐνθεν ἄρ' οἰνίζοντο* for *ἐνθεν φοινίζοντο*, Il. II. 472. *ὅππότεν ἰσόμερον* for *ὅππότε Φισόμερον*, Il. O. 209. *μερὰ τ' ἦθεα καὶ νομόν* for *μερὰ Φήθεα*, Il. Z. 511, &c. &c. Here also it is left to future observation to determine how far, through these and similar safe alterations, the passages apparently opposed to the digamma may be diminished in number, and the list of words, which in Homer's usage retained the digamma, be augmented.

### IX.

1. In order not to curtail or disconnect the history of the digamma, and at the same time for the sake of giving yet more support to the doctrines already propounded, we shall add what is to be said as to this letter *in the middle of words*,—a subject belonging rather to the *dialect* than to the *versification* of Homer.

2. In the Latin tongue we perceive it joined to consonants in *combaro* from *con-uro*; *sylva* from *ῥλη*, or the old *ῥλην*; *cervus* from *κερως*, Æol. *κέρως*, old *κέρεφος* (*kerevus*, *kervus*, *cervus*, "the horned animal"); *volvo* from *φέλιφω*, *φέλφω*; *salvus* from *σάφος*; *arva* from *ἀρόφω*, as *vivo* from *βιόφω*; *curvus* from *γῦρος*, which must have been *γύρφος*. In Greek we find, in Suidas, *δερβιστήρ*, i. e. *δερφιστήρ*, from *δείρω*, and *ὀλβάχχιον*, i. e. *ὀλφάχχιον*, a vessel in which the *ὀλλαι* (of which the true form thus appears to have been *ὀλφαι*) were deposited: we find also *ἐπίβδας*, i. e. *ἐπὶ δαιρί*, according to the Scholiast on Pind. Pyth. iv. 249. and *σιβδῆν*, there quoted; *ρύμβος* from *ρύω* in the Etym. Magn. Add *ἰσφος*, *ἄμφορος*. The sound is retained in *γαμβρός*, *μεσημβρίη*. To

this class belongs also the well-known ΑΨΥΤΟ, properly ἄψτό, in the Delian inscription. Now as ἴσος, οὔλαι, γῦρος, have come from *ῥίσφος*, ὄλφαι, γύρφος, so similar long vowels and diphthongs appear to be of similar origin, as οὔλαμος, ὀρούω from ὀρίφω, τιμή from τίφω, τιμή. So ὕμιλος, πέδιλον, πίδαξ, φύλον, ψύχω, ψύχή, πτώ.

3. The digamma stands also between vowels: *anatus*, ἄατος (ἄΨυτος) ἄτος; *Achivi*, Ἀχαιοί; *ænum*, αἰών; *anernus*, ἄΨορνός; *Argivi*, Ἀργεῖοι; *bos bovis*, βύς βοΐς; *Davus*, ΔαΨός, according to Priscian; *bios* compare *vivus*; βιώ, εἶνο; *clavis*, κλαίς; *divus*, δῖος; *levis*, λείος (λέφος); *lavo*, λοῦω (λόφω); *Mavors*, *Mars*, μάφω; *novus*, νέφος; ΠΙΨΩ, *bibo*; ρῖνός; *probus*, πρῶνός, Æol. πρῶνός. Add ταΨός, λαΨός (Villois. Proleg. Hom. II. p. iv.); δάΨιον *Alcman* (καὶ χειμα πῦρ τε δάΨιον *Priscian*. p. 547.); ΕΨΑΘΙΟΙΣ in the Elean inscription, ΔΙΨΙ on the Olympic helmet, and ΣΙ-ΓΕΨΕΥΣΙ, i. e. ΣΙΓΕΨΕΥΣΙ, in the Sigeian inscription.

4. To this head belong in Hesychius ΑἰΨερός, ἄερός, (Περγαῖοι). — Ἀβηδόνα, ἀηδόνα. — Ἀκροβῦσσαι, ὑπακούειν. — Ἐβασον, εἰσον, (Συρακούσται), thus ἑάω, ἑβάω, ἐβῶ, compare what Gregor. Corinth. quotes as Doric τὸ ἕα εὔα, τὸ ἕισον εὔασον. — ΔαΨελός, δαλός, (Δάκωνες). — ΘαΨακόν, θακόν, thus θαΨακόν, θαΨακόν, θαΨακόν, θακόν. — From the Pamphylian dialect, in Eustath. ad Hom. Od. p. 1654. φάβος, βαβέλιος, ὀρούβω, or, since *ou* arises from the change of the digamma, more properly ὀρόβω. — To this head appertains also what Priscian says p. 547. and more fully at p. 710, viz. that the Æolians placed the digamma between two vowels; "this is proved," he says, "by very ancient inscriptions, written in the oldest characters, which I have seen on many tripods." He cites, p. 547, Δημοφύων, which, at p. 710, he calls Δημοφύων, and, at p. 547, ΛαΨοκάφων, which, at p. 710, becomes Λαοκάφων. Δημοφύων, ΛαΨοκάφων are right; the other forms in -όνων must have arisen, after the neglect of the digamma, from the contraction of -άων to -ων, and the insertion of *o*.

From all this it seems already clear that, in the old language, the digamma appeared very commonly in words between the open vowels.

5. It has already been stated that, before a vowel, the digamma often passed into *u*, in Greek into *v*. Priscian quotes from Latin the *nunc mare nunc silivæ* of Horace, and the *zonam solvit diu ligatam* of Catullus. As *aves* gives *auceps* and *augur*, *faveo fautor*, and *lavo lautus*, so from ἄτω, i. e. ἄΨίω, came *avio*, and with the insertion of *d*, *ardio*, *audio*, from γαίω, i. e., γαΨίω, came *gavio* (hence *gavisus*), and *gaudeo*, *gaudium*. The Etym. Mag. has Æolic αῦως, ἡ ἡώς; Hesychius has αῦως, ἡμέρα; Eustathius, p. 548, has αὔρηκτος for ἄρρηκτος from ἄΨρηκτος *infractus*; and Heracleides has as Æolic δαυλός, δαλός (*Spartan* δαΨελός), so that it was δαΨελός, δαΨελός, δαυλός, δαλός. Observe also *iauchen*, *iauchen*, (in German *jauchen*, *jauchzen*).

## X.

*Of the digamma in the middle of words in Homer.*

1. The digamma appears connected with a consonant, in Homer, in μέμβλετο, μέμβλωκε, παρμέμβλωκε. The verb was μέβλω, μέβλω, as, in Hesychius, we find βέβλειν· μέλλειν (or, as it should be written, μέλειν). Thus μέβλομαι, μεμέβλετο, μέμβλετο, and so forth. So we may explain ἄδδην, ἄδδηκότες, ἔδδεισεν, ὑποδδείσαντες, as having been ἄδδην, ἄδδηκότες, ἔδδεισεν, ὑποδδίσαντες, compared with ἴσος, ἄμωρος, ἄρήκτος, from ἴσος, ἄμωρος, ἄρηκτος, compared also with *duellum*, which was *dvellum*, *dbellum*, and hence *bellum* (perhaps connected with δύελλα), as *Duillius*, *Duellius*, were called likewise *Billius*, *Bellius*. Ἄδδην is found also as ἄδην, without the digamma; and thus it augments the list of words, which retain, or drop this letter according to the demands of metre.

2. We may conclude, from preceding remarks, that the digamma appeared also between open vowels, in Homeric Greek. Αἴω, αἴσσω, οἷς, κηῖς, Ἀρίϊον, &c. since they are never found contracted into αἰω, ᾗσσω, οἷς, κηῖς, Ἀρῆιον, were evidently pronounced ἀέω, ἄέσσω, ὄεις, κηῖς, Ἀρήϊον, as ἀέκων, ἄεργος, &c. were ἀέκων, ἄεργος, &c. Thus likewise θαφαός, θαφάσσειν, ἔφασον, ἄφεθλον, ἀφεί (αἰεί), ἀφείδω, ἀφείρω, ἀφέστιος (not ἀνέστιος), Ἀφίδης, ἀφίδηλος, ἀλοφά, (ἄλωά), ἀφολλής, ἀφύλξ (ῶλξ), ἄφορ, ἄφορτήρ, ἄφος (αῦος), ἀφαλέος (αὔαλέος), ἀφρή (αὔρη), ἀφρμή (αὔφρμή) German *atli-men*, γεραφός (γεραιός) or γραφός German *grau*, anciently *grav*, δαφήρ, δάφω (δαίω), δήφιος, ἐφανός, κραφαίνω (κραϊνίω), from ΚΡΑ, ΚΡΑΩ, ΚΡΑΦΩ, German *kraf-t*, λαφάς (λαās), λάφιγξ, Λαφίμης, λέφων (German *Leu*, whence *Lowe*), ὄφας (οῦς) gen. ὄφατος (οὔατος), ὄφιω, πνέφω (πνείω), φαφενρός (φαεινός), χέφω, χράφω, χρέφος, together with all substantives and verbs of the same kind having a vowel before the final vowel. In case of contraction the digamma disappears, thus Ἀρπειδαφο, Ἀρπείδαο, Ἀρπείδεω.

3. The Homeric language is full of traces of the digamma changed into *v*. It appears in the termination *εὐς*, as βασιλεύς, Ὀδυσσεύς, Ἀρτεύς, Ἀχιλλεύς, Τυδεύς, words of which the roots are seen more clearly in the Latin forms *Ulysses*, *Achilles*, and are perfectly revealed in the forms AXLE, TVTE, ATPE, on old Italian works of art. But like βασιλέφς, so must there have been βασιλήφς, βασιλέφω (βασιλεύω), βασιληφς (τιμῆς βασιληίδος, Il. Z. 193.) βασιλήφιος (γένος βασιληίων), Od. Π. 401. The digamma remained in the vocative βασιλεῦ, not to leave the root open and ending in the feeble *e*, and in the dat. plur. βασιλεῦσι, combined with *σ*, as in the nominative singular.

4. In like manner, the digamma remained in future and aorist tenses, supported by *σ*, though it disappeared where it stood unsupported between vowels; since ἐμπνεύσῃ, Il. T. 159, &c. θεύσσει, Il. Ψ. 623. θεύσεσθαι, Il. Λ. 700. κλαύσομαι, Il. X. 87. κλαύ-

σε, Od. Ω. 292. πλεύσσειν, Od. Μ. 25. χραύση, Il. Ε. 138. demonstrate that their verbs, θέω, κλάω, πνέω, χράω, were once θέφω, κλάφω, πνέφω, χράφω (*German graben*); and, further, the parts and derivatives of ἀλεείνω, κάω, κλέω, ρέω, χέω, as ἀλεύσσειν, καῦμα, κλυτός, ῥυτός, χυτός, point to ἀλέφω, κάφω, κλέφω, (properly *to make a noise*,—so the *German* kleeffen, applied to dogs—as the *German* gauen, *Eng.* gape, may be compared with χάφω (χάω, χαίνω), &c. .

5. In some verbs, the digamma is either retained or dropped in the present, as δέω or δεύω, or is not at all thrown away, as βασιλεύω, ἱερεύω. In some the σ is suppressed instead of it, as χεύω (not χεύσω), Od. Β. 222. and so χεύον, Od. Β. 544. χενάντων, Od. Δ. 214. χεύαν, χεύαι, &c.

6. In the aorist of ἀλεείνω from ἀλέφω, the digamma not only suppresses σ, ἄλενα, ἄλენαι, ἀλεύσσειν, &c. but it is also lost itself, as in ἀλέασθαι, Il. Ν. 436. and so ἀλέασθε, ἀλέαιτο, in other places, which were undoubtedly ἀλέφασθαι, ἀλέφαιτο. Exactly in the same manner we find εὔκηλος and the common ἔκηλος, εὔαδεν instead of ἔαδεν, αὐίαχος, αὔσταλέος, and the strange form αἰέρυσαν,<sup>1</sup> which may be explained ἀφέρυσαν, viz. Φέρυσαν with the intensive α prefixed. From all this, and the preceding remarks, it seems evident that the diphthongs αῦ, εῦ, arose from the attenuation of ἀφ and ἐφ.

## XI.

### *History of the digamma in Homeric criticism.*

1. Bentley was the first who clearly recognised the traces of the digamma in the Homeric poems, and the necessity of attending to it in the treatment of the Homeric text. On the margin of Stephanus's edition of Homer in *Poet. princip. Her.* he marked the lections of several manuscripts, prefixed the digamma to the proper words, and endeavored to alter the adverse passages according to its demands, often improving on himself, as he proceeded, and amassing or examining a great variety of matter. From these notes he drew up a full and elaborate treatise, in which he goes through the digammatized words in alphabetical order, and overthrows all apparent objections to his doctrine. The notes alluded to (called the *codex Bentleianus*) were sent to Heyne, but not the *treatise*, and thus the dispersed observations, and somewhat crude views of the great critic have become known, but the larger work remains, still unpublished, in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, where it was shown to me, in manuscript, together with the above-mentioned *codex*, in the year 1815.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Heyne Obs. ad Il. A. 459.—D. K. S.

<sup>2</sup> The *treatise* here referred to, as I am informed by Professor Scholefield, hardly



2. After the labors of Dawes<sup>1</sup> and of Payne Knight<sup>2</sup> on the subject of the digamma, this letter found in Heyne<sup>3</sup> an eminent protector, who, after his fashion, gave many useful hints, but wavered in his observations, and brought the question to no decision. Both on this account, and because, following the example of his predecessors, he was too prone to change, or to throw suspicion on every passage that seemed to oppose the digamma, and thus to mangle the works of Homer, he gave ample grounds for contradiction, and even severe censure.<sup>4</sup> Soon after the outbreking of this literary war Hermann<sup>5</sup> took the field, dividing the truth from error with singular sagacity, and endeavoring with great pains to destroy the arguments against the reception of the digamma into the Homeric poems, but, at the same time, to prescribe proper limits to its use in Homeric criticism. The neglect of the digamma, in *solitary* instances, he admitted as a proof of the later origin of those passages, in which such instances occurred. The doctrine immediately acquired fresh partisans in Germany, as, for example, Buttmann in his Greek Grammar, and Boeckh.<sup>6</sup> Recently a new opponent to the digamma has appeared in the person of Spitzner, who, however, without combating the other proofs of its existence, rests his hostility to the letter on this single circumstance—that *hiatus* cannot be, by its aid, *entirely* removed from the poetry of Homer; *expellas furcâ, tamen usque recurrit*.

## CANONS AND REMARKS

*In the Hippolytus and Alcestis of* PROFESSOR MONK.

1. Κέκλυμαι is frequently used by the tragic [and other] writers in the sense of αἰμί. Hipp. 2.

2. Πρεσβεύω sometimes signifies προτιμάω, 'to honor or respect. So Choëph. 486. τόνδε πρεσβεύσω τάφον. Hipp. 5.

---

answers to the description given by Thiersch—"full and elaborate." The document consists of, 1. an alphabetical list of digammated words; and, 2. notes on the first five books of the Iliad. Professor Scholefield has, however, no doubt that, if published, these Bentleian papers would be considered of value, and gives some hopes of their publication.—D. K. S.

<sup>1</sup> In the Misc. Criticæ.

<sup>2</sup> In his *Analytical Essay on the Greek Alphabet*, and his edition of the Homeric poems.

<sup>3</sup> In his ed. of the Iliad, and, particularly, the three *Excursus* at Il. T. 384. vol. vii. pp. 708—772.

<sup>4</sup> See the review of his Homer in the *Allg. Lit.* 1803. p. 285.

<sup>5</sup> In a review of Heyne's Homer in the *Leips. Lit.* 1803. *July*.

<sup>6</sup> See Boeckh on the versification of Pindar, Berlin 1809; and, in his edition of Pindar, *de metris Pindaricis*, cap. xvii.

3. *Θησέως παῖς*, *Ἀμάζονος τόκος*: this pleonasm, where in prose we should have said, *Θησέως καὶ Ἀμάζονος παῖς* or *τόκος*, is not uncommon. See Dr. Blomfield's note P. V. 140. Hipp. 10.

4. *Παιδεύμα*, as also *λόχευμα*, *μίσημα*, and other words of the same class, are used for persons. Moreover, the plural form *παιδεύματα* denotes only *one* individual, sc. Hippolytus, as in Soph. Philoct. 86. *τεχνήματα* of *one* cup, Hec. 269. *προσφάγματα* of *one* victim. Hipp. 11.\*

5. *Πάλαι προκόψασ'*, *οὐ πόνου πολλοῦ με δεῖ*. *Προκόψας* is here a *nominativus pendens*; of which solæcism, or archaism, instances occur in Æsch. Suppl. 455. Choëph. 518. P. V. 209. Cē. C. 1120. Phœn. 290. See Kuster. Aristoph. Plut. 277. and Gregor. Corinth. p. 33. Hipp. 23.

6. *Προκόπτω* signifies *to advance*; and is taken metaphorically from those who cut down wood and other obstacles in a road. Hipp. 23.

7. The future of *αἰνέω* is *αἰνήσω* in Homer, and *αἰνέσω* in the Tragic writers. Hipp. 37.

8. *Ἀρτεμιν τιμῶν θεᾶν*] Not *θεὸν*, as Aldus edited and Valckenaer preferred: *ἡ θεὸς* occurs frequently in the Tragic writers in the sense of a goddess, but never when joined with the name of the goddess, as here. Hipp. 55.

9. *Ἀξιώω* sometimes occurs in the sense of *audeo*, to dare, as in Heracl. 950. Pers. 335, and elsewhere. Hipp. 74.

10. *Ὅστις* in the singular is frequently followed by and referred to a plural. See Antig. 718. 720. Androm. 180. Ran. 714. Hec. 359, 360. Il. F. 279. Hipp. 78.

11. *Θαυμάζω* signifies to pay homage to, or honor. Hipp. 105.

12. *Πολλὰ χαιρεῖν φράσαι* denotes, to bid good bye to, to quit, to reject, to discard. See Agam. 583. Acharn. 200. Hipp. 112.

13. *Συγγνώμην ἔχειν* signifies, (1) to grant pardon, and (2) to receive pardon or excuse. The former sense is the more frequent. (1) See Eur. Suppl. 252. Orest. 653. Soph. Electr. 400. (2) Phœn. 1009. Soph. Trach. 328. Hipp. 116.

14. The penult of *Φάρος* is generally *short* in the Tragic writers, but always *long* in Homer. Æschylus has it *long*, Choëph. 9. *Φάρεα* is a dactyl in Iph. T. 1157. and Orest. 1434. Hipp. 125.

15. *Ἀπλακεῖν*, *ἀπλακία*, and *ἀπλάκημα*, should be always written in tragic verse without *μ*, as is manifest from the fact,

that there are many places in which the metre *requires*, none where it *rejects* these forms. Hipp. 145.

16. The penult of γεραιός, δέλαιος, ἱκταίος, &c. is sometimes short. See Gaisford's Hephæst. p. 216. Hipp. 170.

17. Ἀρίσκω in Attic Greek requires either a dative or accusative case; but the latter seems to be the more legitimate construction. Mæris, p. 175, says, "Ἦρεσέ με, Ἀττικῶς ἤρεσέ μοι, Ἑλληνικῶς, καὶ κοινῶς. Hipp. 184.

18. The active voice of συνάπτω is sometimes used for the middle. See Phæn. 714. Heracl. 811. Pers. 888.

19. Φίλος in the poets has frequently the sense of ἐμός. Hipp. 199.

20. Πρόπολος signifies either a male or female attendant; ἀμφίπολος only a female attendant. See Eustath. II. Γ. p. 394, 31 = 299, 1. Hipp. 200.

21. Πῶς ἂν denotes in almost all the tragedies of Euripides, *utinam*, I wish, or, oh that! but much more rarely in the other Tragic writers. See however Œ. R. 765. Aj. Fl. 388. and Philoct. 794. Hipp. 208.

22. The iota at the end of the dative singular is very rarely elided by the Tragic writers: perhaps there are not more than six instances of such elision in all the remains of Greek tragedy. Hipp. 221.

23. The last syllable of κλιτὺς is short in the Tragic writers, but long in Homer. Hipp. 227.

24. Παρακόπτειν φρένας signifies to pervert the understanding; but παρακόπτειν, as also παραπαίειν, is more frequently used in a neutral sense, to be mad.

25. Μαῖα is said of a grandmother, a midwife, a nurse. The last sense is the more frequent meaning of it. Hipp. 243.

26. Ὀδυνάω, though used in Hipp. 247, does not occur in any other passage in the Greek tragedies. Hipp. 247.

27. The last syllable of λῖαν, ἄγαν, πέραν, and εὐάν, is always long in the Attic poets. Hipp. 264.

28. Ὅρῳ μὲν . . . ἄσσημα δ' ἤμῃν. The enallage or change from the first person singular to that of the plural, and versa vice, is very common in the Greek tragedies. Hipp. 268.

29. The neuter plural adjective is frequently used instead of the singular, ἄσσημα for ἄσσημον, ἐγγύγνωστα (Hec. 1089. Phæn. 1008. Med. 491. 701, &c.) for ἐγγύγνωστον. Hipp. 269.

30. Ἀτῇ in the Tragic writers is said of any calamity, but especially of some severe dispensation of Providence. Hipp. 276.

31. The prepositive article, ὁ, ἡ, τὸ, followed by μὲν, δὲ, γὰρ,

is frequently used by the Tragic writers in the sense of οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος. Even without these adjuncts, the article, though less frequently, possesses this signification. Hipp. 280.

32. Both the forms πλάνος and πλάνη occur in the Tragic writers. In Æschylus the feminine form generally, perhaps invariably, is found, whereas Euripides always uses πλάνος: from whence it may be inferred, that the latter form prevailed after the time of Æschylus. Hipp. 283.

33. Εἰεν is an exclamation employed where the subject under discussion is abandoned, and a new topic of conversation started. Hipp. 297.

34. The verbs οἶδα, γινώσκω, μανθάνω, αἰσθάνομαι, &c. and their compounds, are joined to participles of the present, perfect, and future—seldom, and yet sometimes, to those of the aorist: as Εὐνοῖδα σόφος ἄν. ἴσθι δύσποτμος γεγώς. See Trach. 741. Soph. Electr. 1200. Hipp. 304.

35. The Tragic writers used the double forms, ἵππιος and ἵππειος, δούλιος and δούλειος, Βάκχιος and βάκχειος, παρθένιος and παρθένειος. Hipp. 307 and 1297.

36. Ἔρος and γέλος are the Æolic forms of the words Ἔρωσ and γέλως. The former is frequently used by Homer, (but only in the nominative and accusative cases,) and by Euripides five times; in other Attic writers it is doubtful whether ἔρος occurs at all. Hipp. 337.

37. Τί πάσχεις; is an interrogation used by the Attic writers in the sense of the English exclamation, *what ails you?* Hipp. 340.

38. The verb ἀνέχεσθαι is often joined to a participle, as Μόνης γάρ, οἶδα, σοῦ κλύων ἀνέχεται. Pers. 835. See also Med. 38. Aj. Fl. 411. Soph. Electr. 1028. and Valck. Phœn. 550. Hipp. 354.

39. Ἀλλ' ὅμως are words frequently employed by Euripides at the end of an iambic senary, and often ridiculed by Aristophanes. Hipp. 358.

40. The Greeks said πρὶν σε θανεῖν, and πρὶν ἂν σὺ θανῇς, but not πρὶν ἂν σε θανεῖν. Hipp. 365.

41. In Attic Greek, instead of the dual feminine, the masculine is used, especially in articles and participles. See Hom. Il. Θ. 455. Hipp. 389.

42. The particle ὥς at the beginning of a sentence preceding an optative mood signifies, *utinam*, I wish, or, oh that! See Il. Σ. 107. Hipp. 409.

43. Φαῦλος, μάταιος, ὀρφανός, στερρότος, γενναῖος, δίκαιος, μέλεος,

βρύχιος, and some other adjectives are declined, ὁ καὶ ἡ φαῦλος, &c.; and also φαῦλος, η, ον. Phil. 437.

44. The interposition of the words πῶς δοκεῖς; gives additional spirit to a narrative. See Hec. 1150. Ran. 53. Eccles. 399. Hipp. 448.

45. Στέργειν, in the sense of *acquiescing*, is frequently found—for the most part with an accusative, sometimes with a dative case. Hipp. 460.

46. Ἀνθρωπος is used sometimes to denote a *woman*. See Theocr. Adoniaz. 106. and Valckenaer's note. *Homo* in Latin has the same meaning. Hipp. 474.

47. Examples of (1) the double comparative, such as μᾶλλον ἀλγίων, and (2) of the double superlative, such as μέγιστον ἔχθιστος, are frequent in the Tragic writers. See Hec. 381. Sept. Theb. 679. Æsch. Suppl. 287. Med. 1320. Alcest. 802. Hipp. 467.

48. The forms ἐκλῆσα, κλῆδες, κλῆθρον, for ἐκλεισα, κλειῖδες, κλειθρον, are of the more recent Attic, and introduced into the writings of the tragedians by grammarians. Hipp. 500.

49. A short vowel at the end of a preposition, preceding another word commencing with the letters φθ, remains short; but if that other word begins with βλ, the short vowel is made long. Hipp. 513.

50. The prepositive article ὁ, ἡ, τὸ, is frequently put for the relative ὅς, ἥ, ὅ, not only in Homer, but in the writings of the three Tragedians. Hipp. 527.

51. Πῶλος was said by the Greeks of either a young unmarried man or woman. [The same remark applies to σκυμνός, μόσχος, and other names of the young of animals.] Hipp. 547.

52. The participle of the present tense [as also the present tense itself] denotes the *attempt* to effect the action contained in the verb. Hipp. 592.

53. In solemn adjurations and appeals, such as ὦ πρός σε γονάτων, the pronoun is always placed between the preposition and the noun which it governs; and the verb on which the pronoun depends, ἄντομαι, ἰκνοῦμαι, ἰκετεύω, or some similar word, is frequently omitted. Hipp. 603.

54. Γαμβρός seems to denote any relation by marriage; but in the Tragic writers it generally signifies a *son-in-law*. Hipp. 631.

55. When the Greeks wished to express any thing future, on which something else was contingent, then they prefixed the conjunctions, ἴνα, ὥς, ὅφρα, &c. to the preterimperfect, aorists,

or preterpluperfect tenses of the *indicative* mood, just as the case required. This construction must be carefully distinguished from the usage of *ὥς, ἵνα, &c.* with the subjunctive and optative moods. They could say, *χρὴ πρόσπολον οὐ περᾶν—ἵν' ἔχωσι μήτε . . .* i. e. that they *may* be able neither —. They could say, *οὐκ εἶων πρόσπολον περᾶν, —ἵν' ἔχοιεν μήτε . . .* i. e. that they might be able neither —. But it is a very different thing to say, *χρὴν πρόσπολον οὐ περᾶν—ἵν' εἶχον μήτε . . .* in which case they would be able neither —. See *Œ. R.* 1386. 1391. *P. V.* 158. 774. *Choëph.* 193. *Iph. T.* 354. *Pax* 135. *Eccles.* 151. *Hipp.* 643.

56. *Ἔς τε*, signifying *as long as*, is construed with an indicative, *ἔς τε ἄν* with a subjunctive mood. *Hipp.* 655.

57. *Εἰ ἄν* no where occurs in the same member of a sentence, much less when joined to the indicative mood. *Hipp.* 697.

58. *Πολλὰ πράσσειν*, is said of one who meddles with things not concerning him. There is a similar signification in the words *πολυπράγμων, πολυπραγμονεῖν, πολυπραγμοσύνη—περισσὰ πράσσειν*. *Hipp.* 785.

59. *Θεωροὶ* were persons who went to consult the oracles of the gods on any private or public affairs. *Hipp.* 792.

60. *Πιθέως γῆρας* is a periphrastic expression for “the aged Pittheus.” In designating persons, the Tragic writers [and poets generally] frequently employ circumlocutions; and those chiefly which expressed some dignity or excellence, moral or personal. *Hipp.* 794.

61. Those who received favorable responses from the oracle at Delphi, used to return home crowned with laurel. See *Œ. R.* 82. *Hipp.* 806.

62. *Μάκιστος* is used by the poets for *μέγιστος*, as *μάσσων* is for *μεῖζων*. *Hipp.* 820.

63. — *θέλει τε σημῆναι νέον*; these *euphemisms*, in which *κακὸν* is understood, are very frequent in the Tragic writers. *Hipp.* 860.

64. *Σαίνειν* is said of dogs, who wag their tails when they fawn upon men. Hence *σαίνειν* and *προσσαίνειν* signify to fawn upon, to please, to flatter. *Hipp.* 866.

65. *Πρὸς* in the sense of *besides*, with *τούτοις* understood, occurs frequently, as well in the Tragic as in other writers. See *Heracle.* 642. *Phœn.* 619. 890. *P. V.* 73. *Helen.* 965. *Hipp.* 875.

66. *Ἀντλέω* and *ἐξαντλέω*, are properly said of exhausting by means of an *ἀντλος* or pump; and metaphorically, of completing

life. In the same sense the Latins used the derivative *exantlari* Hipp. 902.

67. *Νοσεῖν*, in the Tragic writers, is frequently said of those who labor under any evil, misfortune, or danger, [and may be rendered, "to be distressed."] Hipp. 987.

68. *Καπηλεύω* denotes, to be an innkeeper; and thence, to derive gain from fraudulent means. See Dr. Blomf. Sept. Theb. 551. Hipp. 956, 7.

69. *Τὰ φίλτατα* is frequently used by Euripides to designate a parent, a husband, a wife, or children; and in general may be translated, the dearest objects or connexions. Hipp. 969.

70. The Attics form the crasis of *ὁ αὐτὸς, ὁ ἀνὴρ, ὁ ἄναξ, ὁ ἄγων, ὁ ἀγαθὸς, ὁ ἑτερός*, by *αὐτὸς, ἀνὴρ, ἀναξ, ἄγων, &c.* Hipp. 1005.

71. *ἄθικτος* has both (1) an active and (2) a passive signification: (1) Not touching. See Cæ. C. 1521. (so also *ἄψαυστος*, Cæ. R. 968.) (2) Not to be touched; hallowed. See Iph. T. 709. Agam. 380. The same remark will apply to *ἄκλαυστος, ἀστέναικτος*. Hipp. 1006.

72. *Οἰκεῖν οἶκον* or *δόμον* in the Tragic writers signifies, to be the master of a house or family. Hipp. 1014.

73. *Χαλῶν* is said of one who is exempt from punishment, and may be rendered, *with impunity*. *Κλάων* is opposed to it, and may, in the second person, be rendered, *to your cost*. See Cæ. R. 363. Antig. 759. Med. 399. Androm. 756. Hipp. 1089.

74. The Attics used the Doric form *ἄραρε*, not *ἄρηρε*: as also, besides the instances given by Porson, Orest. 26, (see *Class. Journ.* No. LXI. p. 137.) they said *θαῖκος*, and its compounds; *γάποτος, γαπητής, γάπεδον, γάμορος, γάποτος, γάτομος, κάρανον* and its compounds. Hipp. 1093.

75. The futures *φεύξομαι* and *φευξοῦμαι* were both used by the Tragic writers. Hipp. 1096.

76. The ellipse of the preposition *σύν* is very common with the Greek writers, and especially when the dative of the pronoun *αὐτὸς* is added. See Il. Θ. 24. A. 698. T. 481. Hipp. 1184.

77. The Æolic and Doric form *ἐκρυφθεν* for *ἐκρύφθησαν* is very rarely used by the Tragic writers. Hipp. 1242.

78. *Χρεῶν* in the sense of fate or necessity is indeclinable, and always requires the article in Euripides. Hipp. 1251.

79. The crases in the words *ἢ εἰδέναι* and *μὴ εἰδέναι* are not uncommon in the Tragic writers; as also those in *ἢ οὐ, μὴ οὐ*: the crases *μὴ αὐτὸς*, Iph. T. 1010, *ἢ οἰχόμεσθ'*, Soph. Trach. 84. *ἢ εὐγένηϊαν*, Eur. Electr. 1104. are more unusual. Hipp. 1331.

80. *Χαίρω* sometimes takes after it an accusative of the thing

for which the rejoicing takes place; the figure is called an *Oropisin*. Hipp. 1335.

81. The Greeks frequently use the aorist in a sense little differing from the present, as εἶπον, Med. 274. ὑπεῖπον, Eur. Suppl. 1170. κατώκτειρα, Iph. A. 469. ᾤμωξα, Med. 787. ἀπέπτυσσα, Hipp. 610. Hipp. 1403.

82. The present tenses, θιγγάνειν, ἐρυγγάνειν, φυγγάνειν, κιγγάνειν, λαγγάνειν, τυγγάνειν, δάκνειν (contracted from δαγκάνειν), λαμβάνειν, μανθάνειν, πυνθάνεσθαι, are derived from the aorists θιγεῖν, ἐρυγεῖν, φυγεῖν, κιχεῖν, λαχεῖν, τυχεῖν, δακεῖν, λαβεῖν, μαθεῖν, πυνθίσθαι, by the insertion of the letters ν or μ. To these may be added ἀνδάνειν from ἀδεῖν. Hipp. 1442.

83. Καὶ never forms a crasis with, nor suffers elision before, ἦδη. Hipp. 1445.

84. The Greeks had four forms of the future with a passive signification, (1) τιμήσομαι, (2) βεβλήσομαι, (3) βληθήσομαι, (4) ἀπαλλαγήσομαι. The 4th form is not very frequent among the Tragic writers. To the 1st form the Attics seem to have been partial: the following occur in the Greek tragedians: λέξομαι, τιμήσομαι, στερήσομαι, κηρύξομαι, ἀλώσομαι, ἔασομαι, μισήσομαι, στυγήσομαι, δηλώσομαι, βουλεύσομαι, ἐνέξομαι, ἄρξομαι, διδάξομαι, ἐπιτάξομαι, &c. Hipp. 1458.

85. οὗ δὲ χολωθείς] Here ἔνεκα is understood. The cause of hatred is expressed by a genitive case without a preposition. See Orest. 741. Herc. F. 528. 1114. Il. A. 429. Il. 320. Ph. 457. Alcest. 5.

86. An accusative case is frequently placed in apposition with the meaning implied in the preceding sentence; as Orest. 1103. Ἐλένην κτάνωμεν, Μενέλεω λύπην πικράν. See Phæn. 351. Androm. 291. Herc. F. 59. 355. 427. Alcest. 7.

87. The preposition after verbs of motion to is frequently omitted. Alcest. 8.

88. After verbs of rescuing, prohibiting, and denying, the negative μὴ, though generally expressed, is sometimes omitted; as ὃν θανεῖν ἐρρύσάμην. Alcest. 11.

89. The plural τιμαὶ is used in the sense of *attributes*, *prerogatives*. Alcest. 30.

90. The ancient Greek writers never joined the particle ἀν to the indicative mood of either the present or perfect. Alcest. 48.

91. Ἱερὸς in the sense of consecrated or sacred to, requires a genitive case. Alcest. 75.

92. In anapæstic verse the penult of μέλαθρον is always short. Alcest. 77.



93. The interrogative πόθεν has the force of a negative. Alcest. 95.

94. In sentences where two nouns joined by a copulative are governed by the same preposition, the preposition is frequently found with the latter noun.

Μέλλων δὲ πέμπειν μ' Οἰδίου κλεινὸς γόνος  
Μαντεῖα σεμνὰ, Λοξίου τ' ἐπ' ἐσχάρας.

Phœn. 290. See also Heracl. 755. Cæ. R. 736. 761. Soph. Electr. 780. Sept. Theb. 1034.

95. The plural forms κοῖρανοι, ἀνακτες, βασιλεῖς, τύραννοι, in the Tragic writers, frequently express only one king, or the retinue of one king. Alcest. 132.

96. There are many active verbs which have their futures of the *middle*, and no where of the active form, at least among the Attic writers: thus, ἀκούω, σιγῶ, σιωπῶ, ἄδω, βοῶ, ἀμαρτάνω, θνήσκω, πίπτω, κλάω, πλέω, πνέω, have the futures ἀκούσομαι, σιγήσομαι, σιωπήσομαι, ἄσομαι, βοήσομαι, ἀμαρτήσομαι, θανοῦμαι, πεσοῦμαι, κλαύσομαι, πλεύσομαι, πνεύσομαι. Alcest. 158.

97. Οὐ never forms a crasis with οὔποτε so as to make οὔποτε. Alcest. 199.

98. In the choral odes the sigma is sometimes doubled; as, Med. 832. ἀφυσσαμέναν, Eur. Suppl. 58. ὄσσον, Pers. 559. βαρίδεσσι, Cæ. R. 1100. ὄρεσσιβάτα, Trach. 636. μέσσαν, Aj. Fl. 185. τόσσον, 390. ὀλέσσης, Philoct. 1163. πέλαισσαν. Sophocles uses the form μέσσο; twice in the Iambic senary; viz. Antig. 1223. 1236. Alcest. 234.

99. It is very doubtful whether the Attic writers ever used ῥέζω in the present tense. Alcest. 272.

100. Τολμᾶν and the aorist τλῆναι signify, to endure, in spite of (1) *danger*, i. e. to have courage; (2) *shame*, i. e. to have the impudence; (3) *pride*, i. e. to deign; condescend, submit; (4) *pain of mind*, i. e. to prevail on oneself; (5) *pity*, i. e. to have the cruelty. Alcest. 285.

101. Ὅδε ἀνὴρ for ἐγώ, is a well-known formula. The feminine form ἥδε and ἥδε γυνή for ἐγώ, occurs also Agam. 1447. and Trach. 305. Alcest. 341.

102. The Tragic writers were partial to the use of νεοσσοὶ for *children*. See Androm. 442. Iph. A. 1248. Heracl. 240. Herc. F. 224. 982. Alcest. 414.

103. Ἀπειπεῖν with an accusative signifies, to renounce; with a dative, to fail or faint. Alcest. 503.

104. With verbs of motion, the Greeks joined a future participle denoting the object. Alcest. 520.

105. The Tragic writers allowed the omission of the augment in the choral odes. Alcest. 599.

106. *Αἰθήρ* is found both in the masculine and feminine gender. Alcest. 610.

107. The penult of *φθίνω* and *φθάνω* is *long* in Homer, but always short in the Attic writers. Alcest. 638.

108. The Tragic writers were partial to compounds, such as *αἰδόφρων, ἀλκίφρων, σιδηρόφρων, &c.* Alcest. 678.

109. *Θεός* is frequently said of the *sun*, and generally without the article. See Orest. 1023. Eur. Suppl. 208. Med. 353. Alcest. 738.

110. The chorus very rarely quits the stage after its first entrance till the conclusion of the tragedy. A few instances however occur where it does. Alcest. 762. Aj. Pl. 814. and Eumen. Alcest. 762.

111. The form *οἶδα*, for the common *οἶσθα*, is not very frequent. Alcest. 796.

112. *Ἀλλὰ σοῦ τὸ μὴ φράσαι.* This construction is expressive of indignation or admiration. See Nub. 818. Aves 5. Ran. 741. Alcest. 848.

113. The following are instances of verbs transitive governing a genitive case, *μέρος τι* being understood: Alg. 861. Hec. 614. Herod. iii, 11. Alcest. 861.

114. *Τῶν ὑπὸ γαίας*, not *γαῖαν*: the accusative in such expressions is then only used, when some motion is denoted. Alcest. 921.

115. Several active verbs are used in a medial sense, the personal pronoun being understood; as *ρίψαι*, Cycl. 165. *κρύπτοντα*, Phoen. 1133. *κρύπτουσιν*, Soph. El. 826. *πάλλων*; Cf. R. 153. *κατέσχον*, Cf. R. 782. Alcest. 922.

116. The Greeks said *νικάῃ μάχην, νικάῃ ἀγῶνα, νικάῃ ἄθλον*. Alcest. 1048.

117. *Εἰ γὰρ* frequently occur in an optative signification; but in this usage there is a difference between the indicative and optative moods. *Εἰ γὰρ εἶχον* means, oh that I had! *εἰ γὰρ ἔχοιμι*, oh that I may have! Alcest. 1091.

118. The quantity of the enclitic *νυν* is sometimes long and sometimes short both in the Tragic and Comic writers. Alcest. 1096.

119. The iota at the end of the dative singular is sometimes, though seldom, elided by the Attic poets. Alcest. 1137.

120. The ancients were accustomed to attribute heavy reverses of fortune to the envy of the gods. See Pers. 367. Orest. 963. Eur. Suppl. 347. Iph. A. 1049. Herod. iii. 40. Alcest. 1154.

## ON HEBREW ROOTS.

---

*To the Editor of the CLASSICAL JOURNAL.*

SIR,

I HAVE been considerably interested by the perusal of the following remarks on the Hebrew language, and the utility of studying it; and I think they will prove not unacceptable to many of the readers of your useful and valuable periodical. They form part of the Preface to "*CRITICA SACRA. Observations on all the Radices or primitive Hebrew Words of the Old Testament, &c.*" By Edward Legh,<sup>1</sup> Master of Arts of both Universities, 1642." The preface is addressed to "All such as are desirous of Knowledge in the original Text of the Old Testament." Although it is often disfigured by the careless orthography of the times, I have not ventured to make any alterations; but have transcribed faithfully from the copy before me.

W. L. ALEXANDER.

Blackburn, Feb. 1828.

---

"THERE are three tongues<sup>2</sup> (saith *Hugo de Sancto Victore*) most famous in the world, the Latine, Greeke, and Hebrew, *propter regnum, sapientiam, legem*. The first, because of the monarchy of the Romans, who as they subjected the people which they did conquer to their lawes and customes, so did they force them to

---

<sup>1</sup> Afterwards Sir E. Legh. He was a member of the Long Parliament. Besides the *Critica Sacra*, he was the author of "Annotations on all the Books of the N. T., philological and theological."—"Few men of his time," says Mr. Orme, (*Biblioth. Biblica*, p. 287.) "probably possessed a larger or more accurate acquaintance with the original languages of Scripture. As lexicons they (*Critica Sacra*) are imperfect; but they may be frequently consulted with advantage. Parkhurst refers to them with respect; and on the Continent they have been frequently reprinted." Mr. Orme always spells Sir Edward's surname with an *i*, *Leigh*; but it was written *Legh* by himself.

<sup>2</sup> "*Hieronymus trium linguarum Hebrææ, Græcæ, et Latine, suo tempore erat peritissimus*. Rivetus in Gen. xi. Exercit. 66. Dr. Willet, in his dedicatory epistle to Christ's College, styles Dr. Clerk, *Trium linguarum peritissimus*, viz. in Latine, Greek, and Hebrew. *Mercerus Atlas ille Hebrææ literatura*. Mayerus in Philol. Sac. The ancient Hebrew, the copious Greek, the elegant Latine. See Causab. Exercit. 9. ad Annal. Eccl. Baron."

learne their language; the second, because in it the great philosophers and wise men of the world left the monuments of their wisdom and learning to posterity; the third, because in it God delivered his law and the interpretation of it by Moses and the Prophets to the people of Israel his chosen. These three languages (saith Weemes) were sanctified by Christ upon the crosse.<sup>1</sup> *Latine* is a common tongue, *Greeke* a copious tongue, but *Hebrew* the most ancient and holy tongue: for antiquity it is the tongue of Adam; for sanctity, the tongue of God. In this tongue God spake to the Prophets and Patriarchs; in this tongue Angels spake to men; in this tongue the Prophets wrote the Old Testament; this tongue, as is thought, shall the Saints speak in heaven.

"How many proper names in the Scripture are derived from the Hebrew! And how significant are their etymologies! As *Adam*, *Eve*, *Cain*, *Abel*, *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Jacob*, *Joseph*, *Benjamin*, *Moses*, *Nabal*: not to instance in the Hebrew words of the New Testament which Drusius and Pasor have fully explained. One Hebrew root hath sometimes contrary and usually various significations, which occasioneth the diversity and sometimes contrariety of versions. The same Hebrew word (ברך) signifieth both to bless and curse;<sup>2</sup> חַדָּשׁ piety and impiety; סָקַל to cast stones on

---

<sup>1</sup> "Quæ tres linguæ vel hoc nomine Christianis omnibus deberent esse commendatæ, quod in cruce Domini nostri sint solæ omnium dedicatæ." Hebræa lingua vocatur sancta; Græci habebantur sapientissimi, Romani vero potentissimi; denotatur igitur hoc titulo tribus illis linguis conscripto, Christum esse sanctissimum, sapientissimum, ac potentissimum; eundemque non tantum Hebræorum sive Judæorum, sed etiam Græcorum et Romanorum, hoc est, gentium salvatorem esse. *Gerhardus in Harm. Evang.*

<sup>2</sup> The radical meaning of בָּרַךְ *Barac* seems to be, to *kneel* or *bend the knee*. In this sense it is used occasionally in Scripture. Hence it came to signify both to *bless* and *curse*, as it is generally on our bended knees that we either implore a blessing or imprecate a curse. Parkhurst denies that it ever has the meaning of *to curse*; but, though it must be confessed that his arguments are learned and ingenious, he appears to fail in establishing his point. The authority of the LXX. as to the meaning of a word is not of very great value; for their version seems to have been executed on the principle of the strictest literality,\* and of giving that meaning to a word which it commonly bore, without regard to the context, the nature of which often made another rendering necessary.

\* "It is well known to any one that ever perused the Septuagint, that they often translate word for word, though the phrase that results from it be against the genius of the Greek tongue. This has so filled the version with Hebraisms, that one may affirm Demosthenes himself could not have thoroughly understood it." Dr. Bentley, *Diss. on Phalaris* xiii. 297.

a thing, or to take away the stones out of a place, Job iv. 18. Pagninus translateth it, *In angelis suis ponet lumen*. Tigurim, *In angelis suis indidit vesaniam*. Vatablus, *In angelis suis posuit lucem exactissimam*. Arias Montanus, *In angelis suis posuit gloriatiorem*. Symmachus, *In angelis suis reperit veritatem*. Septuaginta, *Adversus angelos suos prorum<sup>1</sup> quid advertit*.—*Angelis suis appositurus lucem*. Jun. Chaldeus, *Pravitatem*. Aben Ezra, *Stultitiam*. *Et met lumière en ses anges*, Fr. Bib. *And his angels hee charged with folly*. Our last translation, in the Text, and in the margin, *In his angels he put light*.<sup>2</sup> The diversity of these

Neither is his translation of אֱלֹהִים *Elohim*, in 1 Kings xxi. 10. 13. Job i. 5. and ii. 9., justifiable on any principle of sound criticism. *Elohim*, by itself, never has the sense of *idol gods*. It is occasionally applied to idols; but in all such cases it is coupled with the name of the idol, as Judges viii. 33. בֵּית לֵאלֹהִים *Beal Berith*, their god, &c.; or it is restricted by some adjective, as Deut. vi. 14. אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים *strange or idol Elohim*, &c. Besides, it is very evident from the whole tenor of the book of Job, that, at the time of its composition, idol worship had not become prevalent—perhaps was unknown; and therefore to translate אֱלֹהִים *and blessed the idols*, is altogether inaccurate. Mr. Good was aware of this and therefore, though he translates *Baracōd, they have blessed*, he makes *Elohim* refer to the true God; but instead of rendering the particle וְ by *and*, he renders it by *nor*, and thus gives the whole passage; “Lest they may have sinned, *nor* blessed God.” Now it is not to be denied that וְ has often the meaning of *nor*; but it is only necessary to compare the passage as given in the common version with that given by Good, in order to perceive how far the former transcends the latter in propriety and force. Job was not only afraid that his sons had neglected their duty, he also trembled lest they should have committed *positive* iniquity—lest in the pride and madness of their hearts they had despised and blasphemed the *Elohim*. If we adopt Mr. G.’s translation, we must suppose that Job was very ignorant of the general character of his sons; otherwise, it would never have been a matter of *peradventure* with him, whether they had acknowledged God as the author of their mercies, or not; because if he knew them to be good men, he would rest assured that they would perform this duty; if he knew them to be wicked, he would be equally certain that they would neglect it. He *did* know them to be wicked; but he did not know to what excesses their wickedness might lead them; and therefore he offered daily an expiatory sacrifice for his children, “lest,” said he, “they may have sinned and blasphemed” (καὶ ἐνέησαν Sept.) God in their hearts.”

<sup>1</sup> The original is σχολίον τι ἐπιπόησι, “He perceived something *crooked* or *perverse*.” Mr. Good, in quoting this passage in his note, read σχολίον, and translates, “He perceived something of *vacuity*, relaxation, intermission, or failure.” He assigns no authority for σχολίον; and the propriety of translating that word by *vacuity*, &c. may be questioned; besides, the Greek idiom would require the neuter of an adjective, and not a substantive; and there is no such adjective as σχολίος in the language.

<sup>2</sup> To these various translations of this passage others might be added,

translations ariseth from the diverse significations of the word *halal*, which signifieth *laudare, gloriari, splendere, splendere facere, insanire, infatuare*. The word there is הלל, which is diversely rendered by expositors, because הלל, whence it comes, hath in its several conjugations many significations.

“ The same Hebrew word, שׂוּר, (Ps. xxvii. 11,) signifieth both an *enemy* and an *observer*, because an enemy lieth at catch, and observeth narrowly: מוֹסֵר, *chastening* and *teaching*, this being the end of that: כֶּסֶף, *silver* and *money*,<sup>1</sup> because money is usually made of silver: נָדִיב, a *prince* or *nobleman*, and *bountiful*, because he should be so: פֶּסֶם, *simple*, and *perfect*, since that which is simple is in its kind perfect: נָחַם, to *repent* and *comfort*, because true comfort belongs only to the penitent. The better to set forth the force and fullness of this sacred tongue, I shall exemplifie in the severall Hebrew names of God, which are ten in number, as *Jerome* (the best *Hebrician* of the fathers) hath observed. Three of them (saith *Pasor*) come from *being*; *Jehovah*, יְהוָה; *Jah*, יָה; *Ehejeh*, אֶהְיֶה: three from *power*; *El*, אֵל; *Eloah*, אֱלֹהִים; *Elohim*, אֱלֹהִים: three from *governing*; *Adonai*, אֲדֹנָי; *Shaddai*, שַׁדַּי; *Jehovah Tsebaoth*, יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת: one from *excelling*, as *Gnelion*, עֶלְיוֹן. The first and most proper name of God is *Jehovah*, which sets out the *eternity* and *self-existency* of God. 1. His *eternity*, in that it contains all times, future, present, and past: י, *je*, notes the time to come; ה, *ho*, the time present; ו, *vah*, the time past.<sup>2</sup> 2. His

which have been given to it by later translators and commentators: perhaps Mr. Mason Good's is the best, “and chargeth his angels with *default*” or defection; though even *it* may, we think, be improved by the substitution of the preterite *charged* for the present *chargeth*. The passage would thus refer to the *fallen* angels, the punishment of whom was a signal instance of God's purity and power; and the whole would be clear and consistent. Vide Dr. A. Clarke, *comment. in loc.* It may here be remarked, that this example of our author is not altogether a fair one. The book of *Job* is confessedly the most difficult in the Bible; and one principal reason of this is, that it is not pure Hebrew, but rather a mixture of Hebrew and Arabic. To borrow an illustration, therefore, of the diversity of meanings which might be given to the same Hebrew phrase from a book which was not written in pure Hebrew, is hardly fair.

<sup>1</sup> This is not peculiar to Hebrew; but is found in most languages. Thus ἀργύριον in Greek, *argentum* in Latin, *arian* in Welsh, *siller* in Scots, and many others in various tongues, signify both *silver* and *money*.

<sup>2</sup> “ LXX. interpretantur ὁ ὢν absolute; plenius Joh. in *Apoc.* ὁ ὢν, ὁ ὤν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. *Apoc.* i. 4. 8, and iv. 8, and xi. 17, and xvi. 5. *Marcus Mar- tinus* in *arca Noë* ait, ethnicos suum Jovem ab hoc denominasse.”

*self-existency*: it cometh from a roote (יָהִי,) which signifieth to be: God hath his being in and from himselfe, and giveth being to all creatures. The second Hebrew name of God is *Jah*, יָה, which is a diminutive of *Jehovah*,<sup>1</sup> and noteth out the selfe same things. This name is communicated to saints, as *Esaiah*, *Elijah*. The third name of God is *Ehejeh*, אֶהְיֶה, *Exod.* iii. 14. *I am*, or *I will bee*. This name also notes the *essence* of God, and is derived from the same roote that the two former; it implieth God's incomprehensibleness and immutabilitie. Christ alluded to this name, *Jhn* viii. 58: *Before Abraham was, I am*. The 4th name of God is *El*, אֱל, a *strong God*, *Esai.* ix. 6. Aquila translates it ισχυρόν. Tremellius on Junius, *Deum fortem*. This especially declares the *omnipotency* of God. It is communicated to angels: *Gabriel*, the strength of God: *Michael*, who like God? The 5th is אֱלֹהִים, *Eloah*, *Ps.* xviii. 32, *most mighty*.<sup>2</sup> The 6th, אֱלֹהִים, *Elohim*, the first name given to God in Scripture, *Gen* i. 1. בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים, *Bara Elohim*, word for word, *god created*: that is, God the Father, God the Sonne, and God the Holy Ghost created. This noun of the plural number being joyned with a verb of the singular (say some<sup>3</sup>) sets out the unity of the Deity in the Trinity of Persons. This honourable name is given to *angels*, *Ps.* vii. 6, and xcvi. 7; to *magistrates*,<sup>4</sup> *Ps.* lxxxii. 1. 6, and cxxxviii. 1, *Exod.* xxi. 6, and xxii. 19—28; to *idoles*, *Judg.* viii. 33, and vi. 31, and xi. 24, and xvi. 23. The 7th is אֲדֹנָי, *Adonai Lord*, derived from a word that signifieth a *foundation*, or the foote of a *pillar* (אָדָן): this title sheweth that the *Lord*, who created all

<sup>1</sup> This is not quite correct; יָה, *Jah*, is not a diminutive of *Jehovah*, as is evident from their being used together in the following passages: *Is.* xii. 2, וְזִמְרַת יְהוָה יְהוָה, *vezimrath Jah Jehovah*, "and (my) song is *Jah Jehovah*;" *Isa.* xxvi. 4, כִּי בֵּית יְהוָה צוּר עוֹלָמִים, *chi bejath Jehovah tsor gholamim*, "for in *Jah Jehovah* (is) the rock of ages." The distinction between *Jah* and *Jehovah* seems to be, that the former signifies simply *present*, (though *independent*) existence, the latter notes existence *past*, *present*, and to *come*.

<sup>2</sup> Parkhurst affirms that this word never occurs in pure Hebrew as a name for *Jehovah*; and the remark seems to be correct. In the passage quoted by our author from *Ps.* xviii. 32, the word used is אֱלֹהִים, not אֱלֹהִים.

<sup>3</sup> "Others say, the names of God, though plural, are joyned to a verb singular, to declare the great majesty of God and the plurality of his excellencies."

\* This use of אֱלֹהִים is very questionable; and the passages adduced do not appear sufficient for its establishment. See Parkhurst under אֱלֹהִים, and Dr. A. Clarke's comment on *Ps.* cxxxviii. 1.

things, doth also sustaine and preserve them.<sup>1</sup> It is a prooffe therefore of his providence. The 8th is שְׁדַּי,<sup>2</sup> *Shaddai, all-sufficient*, Gen.

xvii. 1. God is in and of himself *all-sufficient*, and all-sufficient to his creatures. The 9th is יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, *Jehovah Tsebaoth*,<sup>3</sup>

*Lord of Hosts*. And as the *Rabines* well observe, he hath two generall troopes as his horse and foote, the upper and lower troope, or the creatures above and the creatures beneath, all ready prest to be employed in warres, either defensive or offensive, for the safeguard of his favourites, or the destruction of their opposites. *Copiae tam inferiores quam supernae. Mercen in Pagn. Thes. Vide Bezam et Piscat. in Rom. ix. 29.* The last Hebrew name given to God is אֱלֹהֵי, *Gnelion, Altissimus*,<sup>4</sup> the *Most High*, Ps.

ix. 3, and xcii. 9. This title implyes the surpassing dignity, excellency and high sovereignty of God, which is over and above all.

"The chiefest versions of the Old Testament are, 1. The *Chaldee Paraphrase*, which they call the *Targum*, of great authority and celebrity: *Onkelos* was the author of the Pentateuch; *Jonathan* of Joshua, Judges, the Kings and Prophets: *Rabbi Joseph Cæcus* on that of Ruth, Hester, Job, the Psalmes, and bookes of Solomon. 2. The translation of the LXX, compiled by seventy-two ancients of the Jewes, at the instigation of Ptolemæus Philadelphus, king of Egypt, three hundred years or therabout before Christ. The apostles much follow that version, because (saith *Zanchlie*) it was so well knowne to the Gentiles, and therefore they seeking their conversion the rather followed it, as if (saith hee) one should goe about to convince a papist of any error in his religion, the wisest way were to confirme things out of the vulgar translation, least otherwise the dispute about that should hinder the maine.

"The principal Latine versions are, *Pagnine, Vatablus, Junius*, and *Tremellius*, to which may well be added our last English and the French translation. The Jews are reported to be so skillfull in the Old Testament, that many of them were able to tell how many times every letter of the alphabet was in the Hebrew Bible. They divided the five bookes of Moses into 54 sections, which they read in 52 sabbaths, joyning two of the shortest twice together that the whole might be finished in a yeere's space. These

<sup>1</sup> "Dat esse primo et esse porro." *Schibler*.

<sup>2</sup> "See the severall etymologies of this word in the booke. Græcis est ἀδράνης, qui sufficit, qui sufficiens est sibi, et aliis sufficientiam tribuit."

<sup>3</sup> "Dominus exercituum quod exercitus omnes pro arbitrio suo agit. *Tremel. et Jun. in Ps. xxiv.*"

<sup>4</sup> "The Greek ἁλίστος; answers to this Hebrew name, used *Luke i. 32, Acts vii. 48.*"



three letters פפפ in the Hebrew Bibles doe signify the *Parasha* or great section of Moses' law, which was a lecture reade every sabboth day in the Jewish Synagogue.<sup>1</sup> It were a happy thing if our great Rabbies and expert Græcians would bestow their time and paines more in opening the originall words and phrases of the Scripture, and in observing the criticisms thereof; how fruitfull and beneficiall would such indeavours be, not onely to themselves and this present age, but also to posterity! How-quickly might there then be (if many would bend their forces this way) a succinct exposition of the whole Bible, a worke much to be desired and of incomparable benefit! How easily there might divers knotty places (many of which arise from the variety of readings) be opened and interpreted. The literall sence of the place is usually to be followed; there cannot be a better helpe for the finding out of that then skilfullnesse in that tongue wherein the Scripture was first written; therefore *a primo ad ultimum* it will necessarily follow, that those which bestow most paines in searching into the originall languages, and are most skilfull therein, must needs be the best text-men and interpreters of Scripture."

---

## CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM GRÆCARUM.

*Auctoritate et impensis Classis Historicæ et Philologicæ  
Academiæ Literarum Borussicæ edidit AUGUSTUS  
BOECKHIUS, Academiæ Socius. Berolini, ex offi-  
cina Academica. Vendit G. Reimer, Libraria, Vol. i.  
Fasciculus primus, 1825: pag. 1—292. Fasciculus  
secundus, 1826: pag. 293—572. Fol.*

---

THE Royal Academy at Berlin has commissioned one of its members, A. Boeckh, to publish a new *Corpus Inscriptt. Græcarum*; and it gives us great satisfaction to witness the progress of this highly meritorious undertaking. The task could not have devolved on a scholar more qualified to do it justice; for in England as well as on the Continent the learned professor of Berlin, the editor of *Pindar*, and of an excellent work on the Political Economy of the Athenians, (*Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, Berlin, 1817,) is universally considered

<sup>1</sup> "Schind in Lex. Pentat. Ainsw. on Gen. vi. 8. Lud. de Dreu on Acts xiii. 15."

as an ἀρχαιοδίφης of the first class, and his name as editor of this *Corpus* has raised among all the friends of classical literature the highest expectations.

We have no hesitation in saying that, on examining the first two numbers which have already been published, we have found these expectations realised, as far as it was possible in the present state of classical literature. A *Corpus Inscriptionum* made up with such indefatigable care and attention, and accompanied by so useful a commentary, is not a work merely calculated to excite the idle curiosity of the antiquarian, nor only interesting to those who study palæography; but it opens also a new field to the grammarian, and furnishes much valuable information to those who make the history of Greece the subject of their researches. For, when printing was unknown, inscriptions were the depositories of public acts, of legislative enactments, and of every important circumstance which private individuals wished to hand down to posterity. Οἱ ἀρχαῖοι λίθους ἰστώντες εἰώθεσαν τὰ δόξαντα ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀναγράφειν, Soph. Schol. Argon. Apoll. ad lib. iv. 480.

Hence it was customary even among the ancients to collect inscriptions. We know from Athenæus, lib. vi. that Polemon, in the time of Ptolomæus Epiphanes, travelled for the express purpose of copying in various parts of Greece the inscriptions then in existence, whence he was called περιηγητής, and στηλοκόπας; and Suidas relates that Philochorus of Athens made a complete collection of all the Athenian inscriptions. Aristodemus copied those he found at Thebes; and Neoptolemus of Paros, called the Γλασσογράφος, collected the *epitaphia*. It is to be regretted that these collections have been lost; but the reason, probably, why the ancients neglected them, was that they had the inscriptions constantly before their eyes, or, at least, could see them at little expense or trouble. During the middle ages, previous to the revival of classical literature, no care was taken of the inscriptions; a great number of marbles were destroyed, or used for building. We may infer from the great number of inscriptions which we still possess, to what extent the practice of setting up marbles with inscriptions was carried in ancient times. But what can give a better idea of the grossly barbarous ignorance of the Greeks themselves, and of their carelessness and inattention to the monuments of antiquity, than the circumstance, that at Castri, or the ancient Delphi, an important inscription is walled in in a dark cellar, and turned upside down! so that it took Dodwell, we believe, a whole day to copy it, with the assistance of an oil lamp. • During the

stay of the popes at Avignon, a great number of antiquities and inscriptions were destroyed at Rome.

In the beginning of the 15th century Cyriacus of Ancona went to collect inscriptions in Greece, and the neighboring countries. He also bought a great number of medals and coins, and brought back to Italy, in the time of Eugene IV. (1436) a most valuable collection. The inscriptions which he had copied have never been published, except partially by Mazochi and Appianus, and from the latter they were copied into the *Thesaurus of Gruterus*. But Muratori has seen a copy of them, and the Danish Baron Stosch was in possession of another copy. Another collector of inscriptions was Johannes Jucundus of Verona, who dedicated them to Lorenzo Medici. His collection has been made use of by Gorius. Next we find Michael Ferrarius, of Reggio, a Carmelite monk. His collection is also inedited; but, as Maffei knew him, it may be supposed that it did not contain any thing which was not already published by others. Maffei speaks of him in his *Verona illustrata*. The author of the *Schedæ Farnesiæ* is unknown.

As with ancient coins, so also a trade was made with inscriptions. The first impostor of this kind we know of is Pyrrhus Ligorius. Gudian has copied a great number of his spurious inscriptions, and lately Fea has published some of them at Rome in his *Fasti*. Ligorius was a Neapolitan. It is asserted that he had a collection consisting of 26 volumes, and that he wrote a geographical lexicon in six volumes in order to illustrate his inscriptions.

In the year 1587 Smetius published a *Corpus Inscriptionum Antiquarum* with an Auctarium by Lipsius. He begins with an interpretation of the abbreviations which are found in the inscriptions. His arrangement was this: he divided all the inscriptions into four classes:—Class I. contained “quidquid ad rationem locorum, operum, atque ædificiorum seu publicorum seu privatorum pertinet:”—Cl. II. “divina omnia:”—Cl. III. “hominum illustrium, i. e. Imperatorum, Cæsarum, Consulium, Magistratuum elogia:”—Cl. IV. “ordinem militum artificum, et ministrorum domus Augustæ.”

Shortly afterwards, in 1602, appeared “J. Gruteri Inscriptiones Antiquæ totius Orbis Romani. Ex officina Commelina.”

The inscriptions were divided into 18 classes, according to their contents: no regard was as yet paid to the comparative age of them. But this collection was more complete than all those that had preceded it. Th. Reinesii “*Syntagma Inscriptionum Antiquarum Lipsiæ*, 1682,” professes to contain many inscriptions that were omitted by Gruterus.

A more useful collection was that of Spon, the celebrated travelling companion of Wheeler, which appeared under the title of, "*J. Sponii Miscellanea erudita antiquitatis, in quibus marmora, statuæ, musiva, toreumata, gemmæ, numismata, Grutero, Closino, Boissardo, Reinesio ignota illustrantur: Lugduni, 1685.*" The archæological notes reflect great credit on Spon; his collection contains also as large a number of Greek inscriptions, especially Athenian, as we might expect from one who had visited the places where most of the inscriptions were still existing.

The study of Palæography was greatly encouraged by these publications. E. Bernardus wrote in 1689 on the Greek alphabets, and B. Montfaucon published his celebrated work "*de Græca Palæographia*," of which Gregorius Placentinus made a *Compendium* in 1725, and Bianconius another in 1748; also Havercamp wrote "*de Litt. Græcarum varia scriptura.*"

In the year 1731 appeared "*Antiquæ Inscriptiones quum Græcæ tum Latinæ, olim a M. Gudio collectæ, nuper a T. Koolio digestæ, hortatu consilioque J. G. Grævii, nunc a T. Hesselio editæ—Leovardiæ.*" The arrangement was almost the same as in Gruterus. Eight years afterwards, in 1739, Muratori published his "*Novus Thesaurus Vêterum Inscriptionum, Mediolani.*" The inscriptions are divided into 24 classes. Muratori cannot claim any great merit for this compilation; he only published again what his predecessors had published before him, and availed himself of the contributions and communications of his friends, or of inedited collections; but he did nothing in the way of illustration, and we doubt even his competency for doing so: he was an indefatigable librarian and editor, but that was all. It appears even that he hurried the publication of his *Thesaurus*, from a motive of jealousy against the profound antiquarian Maffei, who complains in his preface to the *Museum Veronense* of the trick played upon him by Muratori.

Pococke's "*Sylloge Inscriptt. Græcarum et Latinarum, 1752,*" is well known in the country, as well as the various works on Inscriptions by Chishull, Chandler, &c. &c. We shall only mention farther, that Castellier published, in 1769, "*Siciliæ et objacentium insularum veterum Inscriptionum nova Collectio: Panormi, excudebat C. M. Bentivenga.*" For already in 1624, had a German traveller in Sicily, G. Gualter, published *Tabulæ Antiquæ Inscriptt.* of that island.

Hitherto the Greek and Latin inscriptions had never appeared

separately, but had always, in every new *Corpus* or *Thesaurus*, been mixed together. Maffei, although he did the same in his *Museum Veronense*, still felt how desirable it would be to make a separate collection of Greek inscriptions, and to arrange them according to their comparative age. Hence he wrote in the preface to the above work, "*quam jucundum esset, Græcas inscriptiones separatim intueri, ita quidem dispositas, ut præcederent antiquissimæ.*" This hint has now been taken up by the Royal Academy of Berlin; and, whatever rigid grammarians may say with regard to the manner in which Boeckh has acquitted himself of his task, we shall rest satisfied with another remark of Maffei, "*Inscriptiones sine erroribus conglobare impossibile factu erit.*" *Præfat. Mus. Veron.*

We shall now proceed to examine the plan of the *Corpus Inscriptionum* as adopted by Boeckh. There were three methods of classing the inscriptions; either according to the nature of the contents (the historical method), or according to the age of the inscription (the chronological method); or, lastly, arranging them geographically, with which method the two former might be combined, (the geographical method). Each method exclusively adopted has its peculiar inconveniences; for if you class the inscriptions according to the contents, then an ancient inscription may fall together with a comparatively modern one; or, if you arrange them according to the age, then inscriptions of the most heterogeneous contents will meet. In the first case, the antiquarian and historian are satisfied, because that arrangement facilitates their researches; but the student of palæography will find fault, because, by putting inscriptions of different periods together, you derange his pursuits; and in the second instance the palæographer is gratified at the expense of the archæologist. To meet all these inconveniences, Boeckh endeavored to combine the three methods; that is, he first classes the inscriptions geographically, according to the country, or province, or town, to which they belong. He next selects the most ancient inscriptions, so far as the period to which they belong can be ascertained; for this is a very difficult point: since, to infer uniformly from the shape of the letters, whether an inscription be ancient or not, would be just as erroneous as to conclude from the black letters of an English work that it must have been printed before the time of Elizabeth; for the ancients imitated sometimes in their inscriptions not only the letters in use in times anterior to their own, but even the style and grammatical peculiarities. Finally, Boeckh classes the inscriptions according to the nature of their contents.

It is obvious, that it was impossible to please every one by this arrangement; but we think that the greater number of those who desire a work of this kind will be satisfied. If the work concludes with good *Indices*, as we have reason to hope, it will be eminently useful. It is evident, that the editor sometimes found himself at a loss where to place some particular inscription; and for this reason he has helped himself by an Appendix, or by putting here and there a fragment between the general classes, because, as he says, "alibi collocare non potui."

First come the "tituli antiquissima scripturæ forma insigniores;" and then follow the Attic inscriptions, divided according to the contents in twelve classes. The *first* contains "acta senatus et populi, universitatum et collegiorum;" the *second*, "tabulas magistratum, inprimis quæstorum et similium;" the *third*, "titulos militares;" the *fourth*, "archontes, prytanum catalogos, tesseræ judicum;" the *fifth*, "agonistica et gymnastica;" the *sixth*, "fragmenta catalogorum;" the *seventh*, "honores Imperatorum et aliorum ex domo Augusta et decreta;" the *eighth*, "titulos honorarios civitatis labentis, maxime Imperatorum ætate, statuis aut imaginibus subscriptos;" the *ninth*, "donarium et operum publicorum titulos;" the *tenth*, "ordinem sacrorum, terminos, defixiones magicas, suppellectilem variam;" the *eleventh*, "monumenta privata;" the *twelfth*, "fragmenta varia." Sometimes these classes contain again subdivisions, and the inscriptions of every class are arranged chronologically.

We propose, in the following numbers of the *Classical Journal*, to extract and to communicate to our readers those inscriptions which are most important in an historical or palæographical point of view, to give the substance of the commentaries of the learned editor; in short, to acquaint the public with all that is really useful and valuable in such a *Corpus Inscriptionum*, and to add such remarks as may suggest themselves to us, without however multiplying the endless controversies on points which, after having been discussed a thousand times, leave us just as wise as before.



## NOTICE OF

*An Etymological Dictionary of the Latin Language.*

By the REV. F. E. J. VALPY, A. M. of Trin. Col.

*Camb., and one of the Masters of Reading School.*

Price 13s. 6d. 8vo. Baldwin.

---

A WORK in English, having for its object to account for the origin of the fundamental words of the Latin language, has been long a desideratum in this country among the curious and the inquiring. We limit our phrase thus, because in a general point of view our scholars seem to care but little for Latin etymology. Our schools and our colleges either give it very trifling attention, or neglect it intirely. We have known at Cambridge Examinations some six or seven Latin words inquired into on the ground of their origin: but these questions have formed so very small a part of the examinations, that students have not found it *profitable* to give attention to this branch of knowlege. Greek derivations are more inquired into, but still even these do not meet with their just encouragement. Indeed the study of etymology is regarded by most men as utterly useless. How few Englishmen know that Fetter is from Feet, that Filth is that which Fileth or Defileth, that Comfort is from Fortis! And how many would reject this information with marked disdain! Some little time ago the writer of this article was asking in a learned party the origin of the terms Whig and Tory. All were perfectly ignorant, and were quite satisfied to know what the terms signified.

Poor, then, is the inducement to cultivate etymological science! Small is the reward bestowed on the labors of Tooke, of Lennep, of Vossius! Cui bono? is the universal resistance to such studies. But let such opposers carry on their objections, and inquire what is the use of many objects of their own pursuit. We must admit, however, that etymologists have been much the cause of their own disgrace. The absurdities of such men as Festus or Isidorus have oppressed etymology with such cumbrous loads of nonsense, that we ought not to be surprised that the science has not yet recovered from its masses of overwhelming absurdity. Better days have, however, beamed on the world. And although five hundred years hence there may still be much to discover in researches on Latin derivation, yet much ingenious and good matter has been amassed, enough certainly to vindicate the reasonableness of engaging in this study, and to recommend it to the attention of masters and pupils.

The writer before us has collected more information on the origin of Latin words than we have yet seen brought together. The large work of Vossius is well known to inquirers into the study. But the present work possesses decided advantages over it. First and foremost, is the advantage to an English reader of the work being in English. Then the meanings of the Latin words are given, which are generally wanting in Vossius. The present writer has also availed himself of much information occurring in the works of writers, who have added to the stores of learning since the time of their great predecessor. Our author also has presented us with numerous analogies from the eastern and northern languages. Lastly, he has often indulged in his own speculations, many of which are valuable for their learning and judgment. But that our readers may be able to form an opinion on this point, we will make some extracts from what appears to us to be either new or improved on in this work:

*Æs, æris*, brass. Fr. *alais*, splendor. *Æs* in Greek would be *als*. Homer has *αἶθρα χαλκόν*, glittering brass. And Callimachus *διανυέα χαλκόν*, transparent brass. *Æris* might have been originally *asis*. Or *æs* made *æris* on the model of *Thus*, *Thutis*; *Mus*, *Muris*. "Germ. *ær*, brass. Anglo-Sax. *ar*, *ær*, Franc. *er*, Island. *ær*. We now say *erz*. Hence Goth. *uiz*, money. Geim. *eren*, brazen. All perhaps from Lat. *æs*, *æris*, *asis*." W.

*Bes, bessis*, eight ounces or two thirds of an As; eight inches, or two thirds of a foot; two thirds. For *dues*, *duessis*, (as *Duellum*, *Belium*; *Duis*, *Bis*;) fr. *duo* and *as*, *assis*. Properly, two parts of an As. The whole As is tacitly supposed to be divided into three parts. "Ex tribus assis partibus, quæ sunt trientes, duas continet." F. So the later Greeks for *Bes* said *διμοιον*, "which signifies," says Forcellini, "two parts of a whole which is divided into three."

*Calva*, a scalp, scull. Fr. *καλυφή*, *καλφή*, a covering; whence *calpha*, *calra*.

*Cancer*, a crab. For *cancrus* fr. *καρκίνος*, *κάρκνος*, by transp. *κάνκρος*. Also, a cancer. From the same Greek word.

*Dormio*, I sleep. Fr. *δέδορμαι* pp. of *δέρω*, to strip a skin; whence a word *δέρμα*, a skin, and *dormio*, I lie on a skin. As from *ἐδάρθην* a. l. p. of *δέρω* is *δαρθάνω*, the same as *dormio*. Homer: *ἐν κόεσιν οἶων Ἐδραθεν ἐν προδρόμῳ*. Virgil: "Cæsarum ovium sub nocte silenti PALLIUS incubuit stratis somnosque petivit." ¶ Or for *dermio* fr. *δέρμα*, a skin.

In the Additions we have the following further remarks on *Dormio*:

*Dormio*. "Fr. *δέρμα*, &c." A verb formed from a substantive often expresses the use for which it is intended. Thus *Oikos* is a house, *Oikéō* is to dwell in a house. *Templum* is a space in the air cut off mentally by the augurs for the purpose of viewing; *Contemplor* is to view such a space. So from *Δέρμα*, a hide—as hides were in the olden time specially used for lying on and sleeping on—a verb might have been formed signifying to lie on or to sleep on a skin, and so to sleep in general. Add to the passages already cited the following from Homer: *Αὐτὰρ ὅγ' ἦρως Εὐδ' ἰπὸ δ' ἔσπερτο βῶν βοὸς ἀγραυλοῖ*.

*Fons, fontis*, a well, spring, fountain. From *fundens*, *fundentis*, shortened into *funs*, *fontis*, then softened into *fons*, *fontis*. Or changed to *fondens*, *fondentis*; *fons*, *fontis*. We have *sOboles* for *sUboles*, and perhaps *tOnsa* for *tUnsa*. Varro: "Fons, unde funditur e terrâ aqua viva." ¶ Or from *φωνήεις*, *φωνήεντος*, which.



# 148 Notice of Valpy's Etymological

utters a sound ; contracted to *phōns, phōntos, fons, fontis*. ¶ Al. for *fors* fr. *φορὸς*, which carries or hurries forward. As Pons from Πόνος.

*Jam*, now. For *iam* (as Jesus from Ἰησοῦς,) from *is, ea, id*. *Jam*, says Vossius, is a dissyllable in the ancient Comedians : that is, it was pronounced *iam*. As we have plural *ii* and *iis*, so *iam* appears to be an ancient form of *eam*. *Iam* or *eam* is, "secundum *eam* horam aut diem aut tempestatem," as Unquam is for Secundum unicam horam ; and as Aliās is for Secundum alias tempestates. *Is* is explained by Forcellini as not only that, *ἐκείνος* ; but this, *οὗτος*, and the *ἑαυτοῦ*, *αὐτός*. In the sense of *οὗτος*, *jam* is "in this hour." In the sense of *αὐτός*, *jam* answers to Gr. *αὐτίκα* and *αὐτόθεν* and *ἐξαύτης*. ¶ Jones refers *jam* to the Hebrew *יָמ*, which he pronounces *jam*. "From Hebr. *jom*, a day," says Haigh.

*Imito, Imitor*, I imitate. Fr. *εἶγμα, εἰγματος*, a representation ; whence *εἰγματώω, εἰγματῶ, ignato, igmito*, (as *μαχάνα, machina*) for softness *imito*, as Pūmulus for Pūgmilus, Stimulus for Stūgmulus. See Imago.

*Itero*, I do or go over again, repeat. From *iterum*, again ; and this from *ἑτερον*, another, i. e. another time. Aspirate dropt, as in "Ελκος, Ulcus ; and *E* turned to *I*, as in 'Εν, In ; 'Εντός, Intus. ¶ Al. from *iter* or *ti. itum*. "I go often." Black. "Per iter factum revertor." W.

*Lamentum*, a lamentation. Fr. *lacrymor*, I weep, lament, whence *lacrymātentum*, (as from *Atro* is *Atramentum*), and by contraction *lacrymentum, lamentum*. ¶ Al. from *κλαῦμα*, a weeping ; whence *clumen, lamen, lamentum*. As *Momen* and *Momentum*.

*Lanx, lancis*, a broad plate, platter. Hence *lancis* are the scales of a balance. As *ταλάωντος*, a scale, is from *τετάλανται* pf. pass. of a verb *ταλαίωω*, same as *τάλω*, to support ; so from *τετάλαγκα*, pf. act. of *ταλαίωω*, might be a word *τάλαγξ, τάλαγχος*, which might have been shortened to *lanx, lancis*, as *Lactis* from *Γάλακτος*, *Luxo* from *Χαλαζῶ*.

*Locus*, a place, &c. For *docus* (as *Licet* for *Dicet* from *Δίκη*) fr. *δοχός*, Ion. *δοκός*, containing or capable of containing. As *χώρος* (i. e. *χάρος*) is fr. *χάω*, *χάωω*, to contain.

*Miles*, a soldier. Fr. *δμιλος*, a troop of soldiers. 'Ομιλέω, says Damm, is properly a military word. Homer: ἐν πρώτοισιν δμιλεῖ. Thucydides: τὸν πλείστον δμιλον τῶν ψίλων. And: ὁ δὲ πολὺς δμιλος καὶ στρατιώτης. O omitted, as in *Dentes* from 'Οδοντες, *Ramus* from 'Οραμνος.

*Mundus*, clean, neat. As *Mulcto* was changed to *Multo*, *munctus* might be changed to *munus*, which would naturally fall into *mundus*, as *menTax* into *menDax*. *Munctus*, like *emunctus*, would be, *emungendo purgatus*, purged, cleaned, clean. Forcellini explains *emunctus*, as used of style, "qui purgatā, nitidā nihilque sordidi habento oratione utitur: ab *emunctis* naribus et sordium vacuis."

*Nuper*, lately, recently. Fr. *porus*, whence *poriper*, (as *Parumper*, *Paullisper*), *poriper, nuper*, as *Providens, Proidens, Prudens*. So Gr. *νεωστῆ*.

*Ollus*, that. Ancient form of *illius* or *illu*, which was changed from *olle*, as *Imbris* is for *Ombris*. *Ollus* or *ille* is opposed to *Hic*. *Hic*, this: *ille*, that, or the other, *ὁ ἄλλος*, contr. *ἄλλος*, or even *ἄλλος, ollus*. *Donnegan* and *Hederic* write it *ἄλλος*. ¶ *Vossius* derives *ille* from Hebr. *elil*.

*Paveo*, I fear, dread. Fr. *φαβῶ* or *φαβέω* fut. 2. of *φέβω*, whence *φέβομαι*, I fear. From *φαβῶ* is *φάψ, φαβός*, a dove, as *Τρήρων* from *Τρέω*. ¶ Al. from *pavio*, as *Jaceo* from *Jacio*. That is, *pavior* cor. metu. Or from *pavor*, and this from *pavio* or *παῖω*. *Qui pavit cor*.

*Pauper*, poor. Fr. *paveo*, as *πτωχός* from *πτώσσω, πέπτωχα*, which is explained by *Valckenier* "μετὰ φνταρctus cado." Hence *paviber*, (as from *Facio* is *Faciber*, *Faber* from *Salus* is *Saluber*), whence *pauber*, (as *aVlceps, aUceps*), for softne s *pauper*.

*Placco*, I suit the taste or temper of, please. Fr. *πεπέλακα (πέπλακα)* pf. *ἔππελαω*, I come near to. "Non propter accessum ad locum, quod soleamus jungi iis quæ *placent*, aut separari ab iis quæ displicent: sed propter accessum tropicum, qui convenientiâ nature, indolis, voluptatis et morum definitur." W. So the Greeks use *προσχωρέω*, I come towards. *Euripides*: Χρὴ δὲ ξένον μὲν κάρτα προσ-

χωρεῖν πόλει. "Oportet hospitem valde se accommodare civitati," is Barnes's version.

*Pluteus*, a shed, shelter, gallery, covering besiegers on their approach to a town. The word is applied to other things, and the proper meaning of it Dacier thinks to be a plank or tablet. Having observed that Festus explains *plutei* (inter alia) "*TABULÆ omnes quibus aliquid præsepitur*," he adds: "*Et hæc forsitan prima notio. Nempe a πλάξ, tabula.*" Rather, from *πλατύς*, broad or flat, gen. *πλατέος*, Æol. *πλοτέος*. Vossius: "The Æolians said *θροσέως* for *θρασέως*, *βροδέως* for *βραδέως*, &c." Then we have *ploteus* and *pluteus*, as *nUmida* from *νομόδες*, *nUmerus* for *nOmērus*, *hUmerus* for *hOmerus*. Forcellini gives the following senses of *pluteus*, connected with *Tabula*: "*Sponda lecti interior quæ TABULÆ clauderetur. Lecti tricliniariis TABULÆ quæ ejus pars exterior et a mensâ remota muniebatur. TABULÆ affixæ parieti, et repositorium librorum, statuarum, &c.*" *Pluteus* is also a balustrade, "septum quo intercolumnium claudi et sepiari solet." ¶ *Al.* from *πλατίον*, Dor. for *πλησίον*, near. As the *pluteus* was used in approaching towns. But *Al.* in *πλατίον* is long. And the general sense of *pluteus* is against it.

*Possum*, I am able. For *potissum*, i. e. *potis sum*, I am able. So *potis-es* becomes *potes*; *potis-est*, *potest*; *potis-sumus*, *possumus*; *potis-estis*, *potestis*; *potissunt*, *possunt*. So *potis-eram*, *poteram*; *potis-ero*, *potero*; *potis-fui*, *potui*; &c. Virgil: "At non Evandrum *potis est via ulia tenere*."

*Quatio*, I shake. As from *σύν* is *κατασύν*, *κατύν*, *κασύν*, I sew; so from *σειω*, I shake, *κατασειώ*, may have been *κατσειώ*, *κασσειώ*. But from *κατασειώ* may have been also *καττειώ*, (as *πρᾶσσω*, *πρᾶττω*,) whence *quatio*, *quatio*. ¶ Haigh: "Fr. *καθέω*, *καθίημι*, to cast down, to cast." ¶ Tooke; "From Anglo-Sax. *quacian* or *cwacian*."

*Rego*, I stretch out straight. I move in a straight line. Lucan: "*Tela regent per viscera Cæsaris.*" I lead straight on, as a ship, horses, &c. Hence, I guide, direct; and hence, I govern, rule. Fr. *ῥέγω*, *ῥέγω*, I stretch forth. So *ῥέγομαι* is to thrust forwards a spear and wound. This primary sense of *rego* is clear in the compounds *Porrigo*, *Dirigo*, *Surgo*, in *Rectus* the participle of *Rego*, and in *Regula*. The *O* is dropt in *Ῥέγω*, as in *Remus* and *Ramus*. Other languages however afford words cognate with *rego* and *ῥέγω*. "*Recken*, (Germ.), *tendere*, *extendere*, *expandere*. Hebr. *rakag*, Goth. *rakjan*, Franc. *recchen*, Iceland. *reckia*." W. ¶ "Caninius deduces *rego* for *rago* fr. *ῥαχω*, transp. *ῥάχω*. Junius from the Babylonian *rac*, a king." V. But these derivations do not at all agree with the primary senses of *rego*.

*Ringor*, I grin or show my teeth like a dog. Fr. *ρικνόμαι*, *ρικνούμαι*, I am wrinkled; transp. *ρικνούμαι*, whence *rincor*, *ringor*. Forcellini explains *ringor* "*nares corrugo*," and adds: "Translatè dicitur de plantis quæ frigore astricte *corrugantur* et cortice finduntur." ¶ *Al.* from *ῥιν*, the nose.

*Stiria*, a congealed drop of water, an icicle. Fr. *στεῖρος*, hard, solid. As *Gloria* from *Γλαυρός*. ¶ *Al.* for *stilia*, (as *βαλίδς*, *vaRius*; *σηλία*, *seRia*,) fr. *στίλη*, a minute particle.

*Stira*, the plough-handle. As from *φρῖγω* is *frigo*, from *στυφή*, Dor. *στυφά*, firm, hard, solid, is *stipha*, whence *stira*.

*Tango*, I touch. For *tago*, as *Pango* for *Pago*. *Tago* fr. *ταγῶ* fut. 2. of *τάω*, I stretch out, I stretch out my hand, I stretch out my hand to touch or take. Homer has *ποδὸς τεταγών*, laying hold of by the foot. From *tago* is *tetago*, *tetigo*, (as *μαχάνα*, *machina*,) whence *tetigi*.

*Tellus*. From *τέλλω*, i. e. *τέλλουσα γῆ*, producing earth.

*Teneo*, I hold, hold fast, occupy, hold back, restrain, detain; hold fast, bind, engage, captivate; &c. Fr. *τενέω*, *τενῶ*, fut. of *τένω*, I stretch out, stretch out my hand to take and hold. Plautus: "*porrigere brachium, prehendere. Jam tenes?—Teneo.—Tene.*" So from *τάω*, I stretch out, is *τή*, take, lay hold of. So from *τάω* is *τεταγών*, having laid hold of. Donnegan: "*τάω*, properly, to stretch out the hand to take hold of any thing." Again: "*Ῥέγομαι*, to stretch forth the hands and take." ¶ *Al.* from *τείνω*, in the sense of *Tendo*, I aim at, come up to, get, &c.

*Vas*, *vadis*, a bail, surety. Fr. *φὰς*, participle of *φημι*, which Donnegan ex-

plains (inter alia) to affirm, assure, promise. Or *vas* is for *vads*, *vadis*, and this is fr. *φάτης*, from *φάω*, *πέφαται*. "Qui promittit suo se periculo aliqueum judicio stitutum." V. ¶ Al. from *βάς*. Qui vadit seu it in jus. ¶ Al. from Germ. *wetten*, spondere, stipulari. "The Anglo-Sax. *bad*, *wed*, is a pledge." W. ¶ Spelman mentions the Turkish *bassa*, sponsor.

*Venenum*, a poison, poisonous drug. For *phencnum* fr. *φένω*, to kill; whence a word *φερηνόν*, like *ἀμενηνόν*. But such drugs are prepared for medicinal uses, and hence *venenum* is sometimes, though rarely, taken in the sense of a medicine. Valerius: "Vulnus quod nullis . . . levet Medica *venenis*."

*Virgo*, *inis*, a virgin or damsel. Sometimes, though very rarely,\* it is said of one married, as in Ang. Ecc. 6, 17. As we say Spinster, that is, Spinning-woman, for damsel—so the Greeks might say a working woman under the same idea. From *ἐργω* might be *ἐργαῖς*, (same as *ἐργάνη*.) which could produce *verginis*, (as *μαχᾶν*, *machina*), *virginis*. Οι *ἐργων* might be used as both masculine and feminine, and from *ἐργων* could be *vergo*, *virgo*. Homer: Κούρη δ' οὐ γαμέω, Ἀγαμέμνωνος, οὐδ' εἰ ἔργα Ἀθηναίη γλαυκώπιδι ἰσοφαρίζοι. And in Il. 1, 12b, some editions read, Δώσω δ' ἑπτὰ γυναῖκας ἀμόμωνας, ἔργ' εἰδυίας. ¶ Al. from *vireo*, whence *virigo*, *virgo*. Ob *virentem* atactm. "Virgo interdum dicitur de eâ quæ virum passa est. Notat enim non tam integritatem quàm *virentem* etatem." F.

*Uls*, beyond. "It was formerly *ultis*, whence *ultra*," says Forcellini. Or *uls* was for *ulteris* (locis), from *ulter*. But rather, *uls* is from *ollis* i. e. in illis locis, opposed to "in his locis." Hence *olls*, *ols*, *uls*.

*Utique*, certainly, assuredly. For *uticunque*, *uticunque*, as *Ubique* is for *Ubicunque*. That is, howsoever, in what way soever, in every way, under any circumstances.

We have been long in our extracts, because we are persuaded that our readers will not be displeased to read them, and will not be unimproved by the remarks they contain. We will give an instance or two of the manner in which the writer has brought together the heterogeneous meanings of some words—meanings which by their great discordance so often confound and perplex the student:

*Cilio* seems primarily to mean, I clip, prune, as Cicero has "*Colere vitem*;" and to come from *κολάζω*, fut. *κολάσω*, *κολάω*, *κολῶ*, I clip, prune. Hence *colo* means, I clear from excrescences, I trim, as we speak of a bird *pruning* its feathers. Hence, I adjust, make neat, dress, as Dryden uses the word Prune: "Grows a fop, *PRUNES* up, &c." Hence, I pay great attention to, study, pursue; regard, honor, venerate. In regard to the fields, it means, I am attentive and sedulous about cultivating or tilling them. Lastly, it means, I frequent a spot, "*assiduus sum in loco aliquo*," as Forcellini explains it; and hence, I dwell in, inhabit.

*Libo*, I pour out in sacrifice, make a libation. *Λέβω*. Hence, I sacrifice: for no sacrifice took place without a *libatio*. Also, I consume, make less. Again: before the priests poured the wine out, they sipped or tasted it themselves, and gave to those about them to taste: hence *le-o* is to sip or taste; and hence to touch gently; to pass over slightly; and so to cull and extract.

*Umbilicus*, the navel; the middle of anything. Fr. *ὀμφαλός*, whence *ombitus*, [as in *ὀμφω*, *ambo*; and in *μαχᾶν*, *machina*,] then *umbilus*, and *umbilicus*, as in *Amicus*. *Umbilicus* is also a kind of cockle, wrinkled, says Ainsworth, like the navel. "Marina cochlea, cujus testa rotunda et contorta similitudinem quandam habet cum *umbilico* hominis." F. Also, a taper stick made of cedar, &c. round which a book was rolled. Because, when the book was folded, the stick was in the middle of it. Forcellini adds: "Vel, quod pæne eodem recidit, *umbilici* dictæ sunt bacilli partes extremæ, quæ hinc inde exstabant, convolutæ volumine." Pliny uses this word in other metaphorical senses.

The author requests from his readers any assistance they may have to bestow on him. We are persuaded that many observations are lost to the world, because they are written loosely in the memorandum-books of the learned, and are not collected together and condensed. This is the greater pity, as such cursory observations, being made on the spirit and energy of the moment, are likely to be particularly useful. For our own parts we shall only now advance a remark or two. We think that none of the derivations of *Sed* which are given by the writer are correct. We think that it was first *Set*; and that it was put for *Niet*, which was capable of being contracted to *Set* as well as to *Sit*. And we are confirmed in our belief by the writer's observations on the word *Ast*, which however we do not think, with Mr. Tooke, to be so much put for *Adsit*, as for *At sit*. The writer has passed over the true and ancient spelling of *Solemnis*. And this makes the *M* necessary to be accounted for, and makes it impossible that the word should come from *Annus*. Some have thought it put for ὀλόσμενος, corrupted to ὄλεμνος, *solemnis*.

We shall now bid the writer adieu, and thank him for his production of a very pleasing and instructive work. We recommend it to the public, and will venture to predict that it will force on our scholars a greater attention to the etymological part of the Latin language. We would also solicit from our readers any additions which might be useful to the writer at a future time.

We had almost forgotten to mention an ingenious remark, which we will now extract from the Preface, and with which we will finish this article :

Notwithstanding the analogy we have pointed out between the Latin and the Greek, so different are these languages, that, if we take at random a certain number of Latin words, we shall find but few of them correspond in sound to the Greek. A great reason is, that the Latins formed new words from those which they introduced from Greece. Thus *Visio* has no alliance in sound with Ὀψis, nor *Visum* with Ὄραμα or Φάσμα, nor *Invideo* with Φθονέω: and yet *Visio*, *Visum*, *Invideo*, are all from the Greek Εἶδω, through the Latin *Video*. So the modern Greeks express a chain by ζόση, a word which was unknown to their ancestors, but derived from ζῶω, ζώννυμι. Another reason is, that the Latins derived their language from the Æolic tribes, which had words peculiar to themselves, and unknown to the Ionic and Attic races. Lastly, derivative languages apply words in a manner unknown to the early writers in the primary language. Thus the French express the head by Tête, or as it was anciently Teste, formed from Testa, a shell, and so the shell of the head. "Mca testa" for "my head" would have been thought a singular expression by Cicero.

# ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

NO. XLIV.

## *A Latin Charade.*

Syllaba prima, mala percussa cupidine, motus,  
Spes et amoris habet, tristitiasque graves:  
Proxima sed finire solet, saniesque cruore  
Mixa, lues serpit sæpius unde mihi:  
Tota parte tamen comptos componor in artus,  
Forma, decor, vires, ingeniumque vigent.  
Raptum morte ferant quamvis me fata, resurgam,  
Et numero ascribar, Cœlicolumque comes.

## *Attempts at Punning in Greek.*

On the defeat of the Persians by Themistocles.

Θεμῖς το κλεος ὡς παν εχει θεμιστοκλης,  
Περσας τε περσας, και Ατοσσο' ατας φερων.

On Professor Aùthou's edition of Lempriere, re-edited by  
E. H. Barker, Esq.

Ω βιβλιον καλον, νεαροις ανθοῦν τε λογοισιν,  
Τμνων σε κλεινος Βαρκερ ἐηκε βοην.

On the Rev. Mr. Brasse's Greek Gradus.

Πολλοι γε χρυσου χαλκον αντιδοιεν αν.  
Ο χαλκος ουτος, χρυσος ὦν ελεγχεται.

On Mrs. Card, wife of the Rev. Dr. Card, of Great Malvern.

Γυναι προσηγες, αῖ' εφους επωνυμος.  
Πρεπεις ανασσουσα Βασιλεια καρδιω'.

On Miss Barrett, of Hope End, the learned authoress of *An Essay on Mind, a Poem.*

Ορθως σεις δομος λεγεται τελος ελπιδος ειναι  
Ποιον ὃ ελπιζειν εστιν ὑπερ σε θεμις;

H. S. B.

February, 1828.

## OXFORD PRIZE POEM.

### ON CANALS.

Impellitque rates ubi duxit aratra colonus.

ARTIS opus mirum, nec adhuc vulgata per orbem  
Æmula naturæ conamina, qualia nunquam  
Viderat Ausonios regnatrici Roma per agros,  
Musa canas; tu nam tacito sub vespere mistos  
Aure bibis strepitus, et pascua læta pererrans  
Sæpe novo celeres miraris in anme carinas.

Jactet in objecti sævisse cacumina montis  
Indomitus Xerxes imæque in viscera terræ  
Perfodisse viam ferro, fluctusque sonantes  
Æquoris insolitum vi deduxisse per alveum.  
Pulchrior hic labor est, quem non belli ira ferocis  
Poscit, at arridens vultu pax alma sereno,  
Angligenumque salus, et publica comoda rerum.

En! ubi fœcundus tacito delabitur amne  
Undarum Pater, et salices convalle sub ima  
Thamesis irrigue lambit, quæ quantaque rerum  
Apparet facies! quam splendida surgit imago!  
Hinc atque hinc pictis albentia marmora velis  
Sole ex opposito lucent, gravidæque carinæ  
Vix tangunt portus, mercesque in littore sternunt  
Congestas alte, quas frugum prodiga tellus  
Sponte sua, tibi, de gremio Britannia fundit.  
Ad te, magne pater! vasti gens ultima mundi  
Lautas mittit opes, qua Ganges æstuat auro  
Turbidus, et fulvam exsudat Pactolus arenam.

Qualis ubi lento devolvit flumine Nilus,  
Indorum, aut Arabum gazas, vel ab orbe remoto  
Divitias portat varias tibi, regia Memphis!  
Urbs antiqua, potens opibus! stupet incola saxi  
Culmine despiciens radentes littora puppes;  
Quam densæ fluvio incumbunt! ut vela patenti  
Laxa sinu Zephyrosque vocant, fluctusque ferentes.

Tales terra parens, rerum natura creatrix  
Fundit opes tibi larga manu; pelagique per æquor  
Extremi tibi cuncta patent: sed quid vetat artis  
Tentare auxilium, et longo perfecta labore  
Usque sequi studia, et crescentem extendere famam?

Jam non Oceanus solum fluitantia ventis  
Signa videt Britonum, lateque allabier oris  
Miratur densas peregrino a littore puppes;

Quinctiam ausa novis se dudum attollere regnis  
 Nautica res, ventisque aliis committere vela.  
 Aspice qua fruges nuper ditissima tellus  
 Effudit gremio, et flava redimita corona  
 Alma Ceres circum florentes nutrit agros :  
 Jam nauta impellit lintres, et remige tuto  
 Lenta per expansum descendit cymba canalem.  
 Hic neque vorticibus sævis prærupta minantur  
 Saxa mari in medio ; non atra in nocte procella  
 Ingruit, aut tenebris horrescunt æquora circum :  
 At passim veneres naturæ dædalus ordo  
 Submittit varias, dextra lævaque corusca  
 Sylva viret, lætique greges per prata vagantur ;  
 Flaventesque agri rident, campisque remotis  
 Vix tollunt tenues dispersa mapalia fumos.  
 Sæpe etiam tacite puppim mirantur euntem  
 Nocturnæ Faunorum acies, Lemurumque catervæ  
 Remorum captant sonitus, crepitantiaque Austris  
 Carbasa, et ignaros accendunt omine nautas.  
 Ultima jam tellus sociali foedere juncta  
 Mutat opes, nec terra obstat, nec longa viarum  
 Tædia iter prohibent ; optata ad littora fructus  
 Fida vehit ratis, et tuta deponit arena.

Quin lætos huc flecte oculos, qua despicit æquor  
 Allisum lateri, fluctusque immane frementes  
 Urbs Britonum, regina orbis ! quanto agmine fervent  
 Littora ! ut innumeris spumant freta versa carinis !  
 Ipse novas stupet annis aquas, urnamque superbe  
 Cœruleam attollens, spe dulci pectora firmat.  
 Ad ripam confusa manus miratur acervos,  
 Thesaurosque novos inhiat, lætumque salutans  
 Augurium reditus venientis computat anni.

Tales Phœniciis non olim exstructa colonis  
 Vidit opes antiqua Tyrus, licet æquora vasta  
 Huic primum invelherent merces, non Roma triumphos  
 Regales jactans, et multa e cæde trophæa.

Salve magna parens ! tibi sic commercia puppes  
 Larga vehant, effundat opes tibi subditus orbis !  
 Nec belli gravis ira fremat, nec victor in arces  
 Prostratas olim insultans fremat ense minaci !  
 Quin victi late mundi regina supersis  
 Tam lætis felix opibus, quam Marte superba !

Ipsa licet pleno diffusos amne canales  
 Gallia miretur, quoties secura phaselus  
 Contemnit ventique moras, fluvioque patenti

Devecta exonerat peregrina merce Garumnam ;  
 Aut Sina inductis jactet sua pascua rivis  
 Impleri, stagna alta coleus, atque humida regna ;  
 At datur Angligenis, qui tantas vincere laudes  
 Aggreditur, similemque movet felicior artem ;  
 Gentis grande decus ! cui mens experta laborum  
 Ansa per arcanos terræ penetrare recessus,  
 Venturisque novas aperire nepotibus undas.  
 Tu ! vasti moles operis præcelsa superbos  
 Vi magna sese attollens consurgit in arcus,  
 Suspensæque undæ grandi sub fornice spumant.  
 Stabit honos per sæcla ausis ! tibi munera, supplex  
 Mercator pretiosa feret ; tibi rector aquarum  
 Evolvit plenos latices ! non invidus Auster  
 Promissi auxilii ventis spirabit amicis !  
 Nympharumque cohors facilis, lætæque canoris  
 Naiades texent tibi rubra corallia conchis.  
 Ipsa tenens dextra maturos tollit honores  
 Copia fœcundum cornu, collectaque dona,  
 Pacatasque undas fausto supereminet ore.

Tuque etiam, decus Oxonii ! nova flumina cernes  
 Ire per insuetos tractus, et divite fluctu,  
 Fundere opes tibi, læta Isis ! fors fœderæ tandem  
 Juncta novo mixtas volves socialiter undas,  
 Et classes portum insolitas intrare videbis,  
 Atque hilarem viridi in ripa glomerare juventam.  
 Jam quantas cerno longinqua ex urbe per æquor  
 Adventare rates, quas mox devolvit in alveo  
 Tūda tibi exaucto gazas ! urnamque trophæis  
 Insignem ostendens, ipso fœcundior olim  
 Ilisso patrias præterlabetur Athenas.  
 Scilicet et tempus veniet, cum classis amicos  
 Invitans flatus, perstringet littora velis  
 Expansis, tristesque agros, ubi, Carole ! quondam  
 Instructæ tibi magnæ acies fulsere sub armis,  
 Consciaque indigno sudavit sanguine tellus.  
 Has clades secum reputans, funestaque bella,  
 Navita lentus agit remos ; oculosque retorquens  
 Usque avidos, meminit felicia sæcla Geörgi,  
 Dum læto tacitum pertentant gaudia pectus.

Nec te magnanimū heroum Caledonia nutrit  
 Musa oblita silet, quam laudis vera cupido  
 Suscitāt, et patriæ accendit pia cura salutis :  
 Et vos, si veteris quid tangat gloria famæ,  
 Si tanti spes fausta operis, tam fortibus ausis



Usque alacres adhibete animos, studiisque favete,  
 Donec venturo mox surgat tempore factis  
 Major honos, terrisque olim disjunctus iniquis  
 Oceanus coëat, sociasque immisceat undas!  
 Jam nova per siccas labuntur flumina valles,  
 Et tibi, Clyda! optant lætos adjungere fluctus.

Aspice quæ tandem surgunt spectacula rerum!  
 Quam variæ nascuntur aquæ! monumentaque vasti  
 Quanta micant operis! quæ non Hollandia novit  
 Faustis cincta undis; licet huic natura feracis  
 Pletior indulsit latices, fluviosque scatentes,  
 Et late effuso circumdatur æquore campus.  
 Jam sociatæ urbes coëunt, atque ultima regni  
 Littora junguntur: qua nuper rusticus agros  
 Squalentes rastro evertit, sterilemque paludem,  
 Hic plenas stupet ire rates, incultaque quondam  
 Terra situ bibit immissas felicior undas.  
 Sic non ulla sibi regio distincta remotis  
 Arva colit spatii, aut condens semina sulcis  
 Fœcundas nutrit segetes; fert omnia tellus  
 Omnis, et extremos implent commercia portus.

O! una ante alias Britonum lætissima tellus!  
 Si non umbriferos montes vineta coronant  
 Aurea, nec foliis densatur myrtea sylva;  
 At secura quies, tempestatesque serenæ  
 Non absunt, vernant facili tibi pascua cœlo,  
 Et valles resonant crebris mugitibus imæ:  
 At procera viget patuiis in montibus ilex,  
 Venturum auxilium nautis, quæ mole per undas  
 Turrita innabit medias, vexillaque fausta  
 Ad soles alios vehet invictamque juventam.  
 Cernis ut Oceanus tibi circum brachia tendit,  
 Invitatque rates; ignotas quærere terras  
 Columbi tentant alii, proavumque secuti  
 Auspicia, et memori repetentes pectore famam,  
 Impune adjungunt patris nova littora regnis.

Sed quia nam externas late vagor exul in oras?  
 En! majora domi restant, et gratia rerum  
 Lætior effulget: vos o! salvete laborum  
 Fautores, sic nunquam audaces proruat ausus  
 Martis sæva manus, Britonum gens floreat armis  
 Intacta, et gratas pandens pax aurea pennas  
 Usque tegat, ferrumque virenti condant oliva!

*ALCOCK.*

# CAMBRIDGE CLASSICAL EXAMINATION PAPERS, FOR 1828.

PLATO, DE RE PUBLICA, viii. p. 559.

*Translate into English Prose.*

Πάλιν τοίνυν, ἣν δ' ἐγώ, λέγωμεν ὡς ἐξ ὀλιγαρχικοῦ δημοκρατικὸς γίγνεται—*δοιοι το—* νέος ὢν μεταβάλλει ἐκ τοῦ ἀναγκαίοις ἐπιθυμίαις τρεφομένου τὴν τῶν μὴ ἀναγκαίων καὶ ἀναφελῶν ἡδονῶν ἐλευθερωσίν τε καὶ ἄνεσιν ;

OVID. FAST. lib. 11.

Februa Romani dixere piamina Patres : —*down to—*  
Tempora bis quini continuâsse Viri.

## QUESTIONS.

By whom were the Flamines introduced? What was the number at first? To what number was it afterwards increased—and by what names were the three principal distinguished from the rest?

Whence the name of Luperci? Of what date was their Institution? and to what popular superstition do Ovid and Juvenal allude as connected with the celebration of the Lupercalia? —

By what name more usually distinguished than by the Patronymic here used (Actoriden)?

What was the period of the reign of Ægeus? Over what territory? and to what circumstance is the allusion here made?

Who was the son of Amphiarus and Eriphyle? and on account of the murder of whom was he persecuted by the Furies? Why is *Achelous* here distinguished by the epithet *Naupactous*? and what is the figure in prosody which is here disregarded? Whence also does the figure derive its name?

Mark the three distinctions of the Roman year with the names of the months and the number of days in each, as used by Romulus, Numa Pompilius, and Julius Cæsar.

Why is the present year termed *Bissexile*?

SHAKSPEARE, JUL. CÆS. Act ii.

*To be translated into Greek Iambics.*

CAL. What mean you, Cæsar? Think you to walk forth?

—*down to—*

Will come, when it will come.

TACITI ANN. lib. xvi. § 29.

Cum per hæc atque talia Marcellus, ut erat torvus et minax, voce, vultu, oculis ardesceret;—*down to—* Accusatoribus

Eprio et Cossutiano quinquagies sestertium singulis, Ostorio duodecies, et quaestoria insignia tribuuntur.

### QUESTIONS.

Quote the verses of Juvenal which allude to this transaction. (Cliens hic Sorani, &c.)

Express these sums (*quinquagies sestertium* and *duodecies*) in English money, and explain the Roman method of reckoning by sesterces.

*Some English Verses to be translated into Latin Hexameters.*

### CIC. ORAT. PRO CN. PLANCIO, § 19.

Jam, ut ego doceo, gratiosum esse tribulibus Plancium, quod multis benigne fecerit,—*down to*—qui iis denique debet esse jucundus, quorum dignitati populus Romanus testimonium, non beneficium ambitioni dedit.

### QUESTIONS.

Explain briefly the institutions of the Comitia Curiata, Centuriata, and Tributa, as well as the origin of our term *Prærogative*.

What persons were comprised in the Nobilitas Romana?

### PLAUT. AUL. Act. III. Sc. 5.

MEG. Nulla igitur dicat : Equidem dotem ad te attuli  
—*down to*—

Incommoditates, sumtusque intolerabiles.

### PERS. SAT. v. 52.

Mille hominum species, et rerum discolor usus—*down to*—  
Cum rota posterior curias, et in axe secundo.

### QUESTIONS

To what Greek words does *chiragra* owe its meaning?

Cleanthes was the successor of whom? and what were the principal points in the doctrine, which the Sect, to which he belonged, promulgated?

How are any similar ideas expressed by Horace?

Against whom was the Satire of Persius more particularly directed? and when did he die?

### SOPH. ŒD. COL.

ΟΙ. ὦ πότνια δεινῶπες, εὔτε νῦν ἔδρας—*down to*—  
ἔνεστιν ὑλᾶβεια τῶν ποιουμένων.

*Some Greek Hexameters to be translated into English Prose.*

*Some English Prose to be translated into Latin Prose.*

ARISTOPH. VESP.

ΞΑΝ. Νόσον γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἀλλόκοτον αὐτοῦ νοσεῖ—down to—  
μοχλοῖσιν ἐγκλείσαντες, ὡς ἂν μὴ ᾔη.

QUESTION.

Explain the various judicial allusions in the preceding passage.

ARISTOT. POLITIC. III. 1.

*Translate into English Prose.*

Τίς μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν ὁ πολίτης, ἐκ τούτων φανερόν—down to—πολ-  
λαχῶς γὰρ τῆς πόλεως λεγομένης, ἐστὶ πως εὐμάθεια τῆς τοιαύτης  
ζητήσεως.

QUESTIONS.

Mention the titles and subjects of Aristotle's other political works. What peculiarity is there in his use of the word ἀρχή in this passage? What particular sense was attached to the word πολιτεία in his time?

What were the qualifications of birth required for a citizen of Athens? What for an Archon? What alteration and relaxation is the Athenian law on this head said to have undergone in the time of Pericles?

Illustrate the phrase ὡς ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν by its opposite. To what is ἀπλῶς opposed in the following sentence, (Ethic. Nicom. I. 7.) καὶ ἀπλῶς δὴ τέλειον (λέγομεν) τὸ καθ' αὐτὸ αἰρετὸν αἰεὶ, καὶ μηδέποτε δι' ἄλλο?

Explain the double meanings in the simile of Gorgias, and the nature and solution of the ἀπορία to which it refers.

State the principal points of resemblance and difference between the Attic προστάτης and the Roman patronus. How do the Greek writers render *ciens* and according to what analogy? Explain the phrases νέμειν προστάτην, προστάτου γράφεσθαι. Define δικὴ ἀπροστασίου, δικὴ ἀποστασίου.

What was the nature and object of the changes introduced by Cleisthenes into the Athenian constitution? Why were the ancient subdivisions of the Attic tribes inapplicable to his?

Explain the following compendious account of the revolutions in the government of Athens: Ἦσαν ἔρα Ἀθηναῖοι δυνάεις εἰς τὰς πολιτείας εὐτράπελοι, καὶ ἐπιτήδειοι πρὸς τὰς μεταβολὰς παντὸς μᾶλλον. Βασιλείαν μὲν γὰρ ἤνεγκαν σιφφρόνως ἐπὶ Κέκροπος, καὶ ἔρεχθέως, καὶ Θησεῖος καὶ τῶν Κοδριδῶν κάτω. Τυραννίδος ἐπειράθησαν ἐπὶ τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν: Ἀριστοκρατία δὲ ἐχρήσαντο μέχρι τῶν Τετρακοσίων: Εἶτα ὕστερον Δέκα τῶν πολιτῶν καθ' ἑκάστον ἔτος ἤρχον τῆς πόλεως: Τελευταῖον δὲ ἐγένετο Ἀναρχία. (Æl. V. H. v. 13.) When did the Ἀναρχία begin, and how long did it last?

ISOCRATES, Περὶ Ἀντιδ.

*Translate into English Prose.*

Εἰ μὲν ὅμοιος ἦν ὁ λόγος, ὁ μέλλων ἀναγνωσθήσεσθαι, τοῖς πρὸς τοὺς ἀγῶνας, ἢ πρὸς τὰς ἐπιδείξεις γεγραμμένοις, οὐδὲν ἂν δεῖ προδιαλεχθῆναι περὶ αὐτοῦ—down to—καὶ καταλαξονευομένου περὶ τε τοῦ

πλούτου καὶ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν μαθητῶν, ἔγνωσαν ἔμῃ εἶναι τὴν λειτουργίαν.

### QUESTIONS.

What opinion on the character and genius of Isocrates does Plato put into the mouth of Socrates? Under whom did he study rhetoric? What is said to have been the ordinary price of his instructions and the number of his scholars? Mention the most distinguished of them. Which of his works are λόγοι πρὸς ἐπίδειξιν? What specimens has he left of the γένος συμβουλευτικόν? What were his favorite political schemes?

Enumerate and define the Attic λειτουργίαι. What is the difference between λειτουργία and εἰσφορά? Describe the course of proceeding in an ἀντίδοσις.

How was the Athenian navy constituted before the time of Cleisthenes? What were the duties of a τριηραρχος? Give an account of the συμμορίαί and of the reform introduced into the trierarchical system by Demosthenes.

What is the difference between συμβόλαια and σύμβολα? Explain the phrases ἀπὸ συμβόλων κοινωνεῖν, ἀπὸ συμβόλων δικάζεσθαι. Translate the following passage: καὶ ἐλασσούμενοι γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ξυμβολαῖαις πρὸς τοὺς ζυμμάχους δίκαις, καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν, αὐτοῖς ἐν τοῖς ὁμοῖοις νόμοις ποιήσαντες τὰς κρίσεις φιλοδικεῖν δοκοῦμεν. (Thucyd. i. 77.) What are ξυμβόλαιαι δίκαι?

Give the derivation of ὑπόγειος and ἀλάζων. Explain the definition in Theophrastus: ἡ ἀλαζονεία—προσδοκία τινῶν ἀγαθῶν οὐκ ὄντων: and express it in different Greek.

BURKE, REFLECTIONS ON THE REVOLUTION  
IN FRANCE, p. 178.

*Translate into Greek Prose.*

A perfect democracy is the most shameless thing in the world—down to—but a most contemptible prey to the servile ambition of popular sycophants or courtly flatterers.

## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

*The Delphin and Variorum Classics*, Nos. 109 to 112, containing *Livy*. Pr. 1*l.* 1*s.* per No.—Large paper, double. Present Subscription, 983.

As it may not be convenient to new Subscribers to purchase at once all the Nos. now published, Mr. Valpy will accommodate such by delivering one or two back Nos. with each new No. till the set is completed. Very few copies are left for disposal.

*An Etymological Dictionary of the Latin Language*, by the Rev. F. E. J. VALPY, A.M. of Trinity College, Cambridge, and one of the Masters of Reading School. One vol. 8vo. Price 13*s.* 6*d.* boards.

A new Edition, being the eleventh, of *The Elements of Greek Grammar*, with Notes for the use of those who have made some progress in the language. By R. VALPY, D.D. F.A.S. With considerable improvements. 8vo. Price 6s. 6d. boards.

*Elegantia Latinæ*, or Rules and Exercises illustrative of elegant Latin Style. Intended for the use of the middle and higher classes of Grammar Schools. By the Rev. E. VALPY, B.D. Head Master of Norwich School. Ninth Edition, with considerable improvements and additions.—A general list of Phrases, as used in the original, and an Index, are added. Price 4s. 6d.

*Eutropius, with a double Translation*, for the use of students on the Hamiltonian system; the text and the translations repeated separately, to furnish exercises for pupils. 1 vol. 8vo. 10s.

*Voltaire's History of Charles the Twelfth*, on the same plan, with a Preface, explanatory of the object and use of the double translation, and Notes. 2 vols. 8vo. 15s.

*An Index Verborum to the Medea of Euripides*, as edited by PORSON:—intended as an Accompaniment to Edwards's Edition of Porson's *Medea of Euripides*. 1s. bds.

*A Latin Grammar, compiled from the best editions of the Roman Classics now extant, and adapted to the mode of teaching by Termination*. By D. B. HICKIE, Master of Bracondale School, near Norwich. Longman and Co. 1828. Price 6s. 6d. boards.

The object of the present publication is to correct the *falsities* and supply the *defects* of the common Grammar. Many scholars have of late engaged, professedly, in a similar undertaking, and with similar views; but all have wholly overlooked the *two great errors* which disgrace the Eton Grammar, and which above all required correction—*wrong Genders* and *false Perfects*; not to speak of the absurdity of clogging the Latin Verb with a host of Supines, which never existed except in the brain of Grammarians. An incredible number of such falsities might be here adduced, if necessary; but they will be found noticed in the following pages. When it is a known truth, that very few Latin Verbs have what are called Supines, why should not the Supine be excluded from the formation of the Latin Verb, and the Perfect Participle Passive substituted instead, as in other languages? When many of the Perfects found in Grammars and Dictionaries are formed solely from Analogy, and have no existence in the Classics, why should not such Perfects be erased, and those only substituted which are found in the writings of the ancients?

The Grammatical Institutes of Priscian were the chief groundwork of the early Latin Grammars. A comparison of his works, as edited by Krehl in 2 vols. 8vo. Lips. 1819-20, with the edition by Putsch in 4to. Hanov. 1605, will fully prove the futility of compiling a Grammar from such materials. Succeeding compilers have been content with following the dictum of their predecessors, not giving themselves the

trouble of referring altogether to the true source, the Latin Classics. This reference has at length been made: and, although it had occupied several years, such is the result, that the present compiler has reason to be pleased with his labor, and trusts the public also will not deem the time mispent. His avocation as one of the Editors of Mr. Valpy's incorporated Edition of the *Delphin and Variorum Classics*, for the last six years, has conducted much to promote his research, and afforded him an opportunity of consulting, not only the very best Indexes of the Latin Classics, but also many other works of reference rarely to be met with.

The method of the present Grammar may, to some, appear complex, and the rules too numerous; but these objections must vanish, when the mode of teaching it shall have been pointed out. It is not the compiler's intention, that all the rules should be committed to memory: not is it, indeed, necessary; for, as Seneca very justly observes, "*Longum iter est per præcepta, breve et efficax per exempla.*" It is absolutely necessary, however, that a *sufficiency* of rules should be given in an elementary work of this kind, as *guides* for the learner. Oral explanation from a diligent master, with constant parsing, will be sufficient to impress most of the rules of Accidence on the youthful memory. But when a general rule has many exceptions, as, for instance, in the *Rules for the Genders of Nouns*, such exceptions must be fixed indelibly in the mind, and for this reason they have been comprised in Latin Hexameters. These exceptions, however, are not intended for the mere beginner.

In the Etymological part two sorts of type have been used, Long Primer and Brevier. At first the pupil should commit to memory the Paradigmata of Substantives, Adjectives, Pronouns, and Verbs, with a few Definitions of the Parts of Speech, and of their Accidence, &c. besides the lists of Irregular Verbs in pp. 125-128. 134-139. 142-180. Afterwards he should learn as much of the English Rules in the larger type, as the master may think necessary for the time. When he is perfect in the Paradigmata, he should be accustomed to decline Substantives and Adjectives together, Adjectives by themselves through all degrees of Comparison, and to turn all the variations of an Active Verb into a Passive form, and *versa vice*. It will be useful also to make him decline Substantives in the following manner, taking all similar Cases together:—

*Sing. Nom.* Dominus; *Voc.* Domine; *Gen.* Domini; *Dat. et Abl.* Domino; *Acc.* Dominum. *Plur. Nom. et Voc.* Domini; *Gen.* Dominorum; *Dat. et Abl.* Dominis; *Acc.* Dominos.

*Sing. Nom. Acc. et Voc.* Regnum; *Gen.* Regni; *Dat. et Abl.* Regno. *Plur. Nom. Acc. et Voc.* Regna; *Gen.* Regnorum; *Dat. et Abl.* Regnis.

*Sing. Nom. et Voc.* Honor; *Gen.* Honoris; *Dat.* Honori; *Acc.* Honorem; *Abl.* Honore. *Plur. Nom. Acc. et Voc.* Honores; *Gen.* Honorum; *Dat. et Abl.* Honoribus.

For exercises of this nature, copious lists of Substantives, Adjectives, and Verbs, have been added throughout.

In compiling the Syntax two objects have been kept in view, brevity and perspicuity; yet brief as it is, it embraces every observation contained in the Eton Syntax, with the exception of its falsities; besides many other necessary remarks not to be found in that Abridgment of Lally. The Eton arrangement has been retained as far as was consistent with the present plan; and sometimes the language of Ruddiman,

when consistent with truth and perspicuity. In citing examples neither have been followed; as the examples here given are derived purely from the best classical sources. It is printed on types of three sizes. The most important Rules are in the largest type, and to be learned first. The examples are without English, for the purpose of initiating the youthful pupil in construing, who, after he has once learned the principal Rules, and carefully parsed and construed the examples, may proceed to the Latin Delectus, or some other easy book, and at the same time commence turning simple English sentences into Latin. The Rules in smaller type are now to be taught, and applied to the daily lessons in construing. The notes in the smallest type, as well as those in the other parts of the book, are intended for the more advanced student.

The fourth part of Grammar has been here omitted; it being the compiler's intention to republish, in a separate volume, his *Treatise on Latin Prosody*, now out of print. But the quantities of almost every Latin word throughout have been carefully marked, for the purpose of insuring a correct pronunciation; so that when a pupil has twice gone through this little book with care, he must have acquired a tolerable knowledge of Quantity.

Thus far he has deemed it necessary to preface his little work, which to the judicious scholar and the candid critic he humbly submits, that it may speak more fully for itself.

*A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews.* By MOSES STUART, Associate Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover, America. One vol. 14s.

The *Miscellanea Sacra* of John Shute, first Viscount Barrington; with an Essay on the Dispensations of God as revealed in Scripture. To which are added, several letters between his Lordship and Dr. Lardner, now first published. A new edition; with a Life of the Author, and a brief Memoir of his son, Shute Barrington, late Lord Bishop of Durham. By the REV. GEORGE TOWNSEND, A.M. Prebendary of Durham, and Vicar of Northallerton.

*Briani Waltoni S. T. P. in Biblia Polyglotta Prolegomena specialia recognovit, Dathianisque et Vartorum Notis suas immiscuit,* F. WRANGHAM, A.M. S.R.S. Clevelandia Archidiaconus. 2 vols: 8vo. 1l. 8s. bds.

*Æschylus: recensuit* JAC. SCHOLEFIELD, A.M. Græc. Lit. Prof. Reg. 1 vol. 8vo. 10s. bds.

*A Vocabulary to the Œdipus Tyrannus of Sophocles; containing the composition, derivation, and English meaning of every word, with figures of reference to the text, and occasional explanations.* By G. HUGHES, A.M.

Mr. Bagster, the bookseller, has lately published *A Comprehensive Bible*, containing the Old and New Testaments according



to the authorised version, with the various readings and marginal notes usually printed therewith: a general Introduction containing disquisitions on the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures,—various divisions and marks of distinction in the Sacred Writings,—ancient versions,—coins, weights, and measures,—various sects among the Jews: introductions and concluding remarks to each Book: the parallel passages (nearly half a million) contained in Canne's Bible, Dr. A. Clarke's Commentary, Rev. J. Brown's Self-interpreting Bible, Dr. Blayney's Bible, Bp. Wilson's Bible edited by Crutwell, Rev. T. Scott's Commentary, and the English version of Bagster's Polyglott Bible, systematically arranged: philological and explanatory notes: table of contents, arranged in historical order: an analysis and compendium of the Holy Scriptures: a chronological index, interspersed with synchronisms of the most important epochs and events in profane history: an index of the subjects contained in the Old and New Testaments: and an index to the notes, introductions, and concluding remarks.—1l. 10s. bds.; demy, 2l. 5s.; royal, 3l. 10s.; and, on fine large writing paper, having four inches of margin for Ms. Notes, being intended to supersede expensive and voluminous interleaved Bibles, 3l. 15s.

IN THE PRESS.

The *Medea of Euripides*, on the plan of the *Hecuba*, by the Rev. J. R. MAJOR. Duod. Price 5s. Will be published in May.

*An Abridgment and Translation of VIGER, BOS, HOOGEVEEN, and HERMANN*, for the use of Schools. By the Rev. J. SEAGER, Author of the "*Critical Observations on Classical Authors*," and several Greek criticisms in the *Classical Journal*.—The four Works will form about 220 pages each, and may be purchased separately, or together in one vol. 8vo. VIGER will be published in May. Price 7s.

New edition of the complete works of the German Reformers. *Corpus Reformatorum*, seu Opera quæ supersunt omnia Scriptor. Sec. XVI., qui de Sacror. Christianor. emendatione optime meriti, pro patribus et auctoribus Ecclesiæ Evangelicæ habendi sunt; M. Lutheri, Phil. Melanthonis. H. Zwinglii, J. Calvini aliorumque. 8vo. Halæ. The price will be 5s. for 24 sheets. The first vol. will appear in July.

*Rosenmülleri Scholia in Vetus Testamentum in Compendium redacta*. 8vo. The first vol. will be published at Easter, and the remainder in immediate succession. The 18 volumes of the larger work are in this abridgment compressed into seven.

*Aristotelis Opera Omnia*, edente Imm. Bekkero. Printing at the expense of the Prussian Academy.

A New edition in Octavo, with Maps and Plans, of the *Scriptores Historiæ Byzantinæ*. Edited by B. G. NIEBUHR.

This Collection will contain the Authors comprised in the Paris edition, 1648, &c.; with the supplementary works edited by Poggini. The text will be given, in general, from the Paris edition, and a correction of the most flagrant errors marked in the margin. The Latin translations will be revised, and copious Indices Rerum et Verborum subjoined to each volume.

It is intended to publish the Collection entire, with all subsequent additions; the Prefaces of former Editors complete; and, at the end of the series, Ducange's Glossary, much enlarged.

Procopius, Agathias, Theophylactus, Simocatta, and Anna Comnena, will be the Authors first published. Agathias is already at press.

The average price will be 10s. 6d. for thirty sheets on common paper, 13s. 6d. on fine, and 16s. 6d. on vellum paper; to be raised one-fourth on the publication of the first volume.

On the 1st of May will be published, in 4to., Part 1. of the *Oxford Atlas of Ancient Geography*, with Maps and Plans, illustrative of the most popular Grecian and Roman Historians.

*The Bibliographer's Manual*; being an account of rare, curious, and useful books, published in or relating to Great Britain and Ireland, from the invention of printing; with bibliographical and critical notices, collations of the rarer articles, and the prices at which they have sold in the present century. By WILLIAM THOMAS LOWNDES.

Although the utility of Brunet's celebrated "*Manuel du Libraire*" has been universally acknowledged, it is extraordinary that no similar work has been attempted in our own language, and with especial reference to the literature of this country.

To supply this defect is the chief, but not the only, object of the compilation now submitted to the notice of the Public; for whilst the arrangement of Monsieur Brunet's work will, to a certain extent, form the plan of the present, the latter will, it is confidently presumed, possess original claims to the attention of the Literary World.

THE BIBLIOGRAPHER'S MANUAL will contain upwards of twenty thousand articles, in strictly alphabetical order, under the names of their respective authors, presenting a list of the principal works in the various departments of Divinity, Ecclesiastical and Civil History, more particularly of Great Britain, Jurisprudence, Philosophy, Sciences, the Arts, Biography, Voyages and Travels, Philology, Belles Lettres, Heraldry, Poetry, and the Drama.

The work will be published in nine parts, price 7s. each Part. The first Part will appear in March, and regularly afterwards on the first of every alternate month, and will form three handsome volumes. A few copies only will be printed on larger paper, price 15s. each,

## PREPARING FOR THE PRESS.

The celebrated Victor Cousin, Professor of Philosophy at Paris, is engaged in preparing for the Press a new edition of the *Hymns of Proclus*, which are published in the *Bibliotheca Græca* of Fabricius; together with two more by the same Philosopher, which were discovered by Mr. Taylor the Platonist, among the Harleian Mss. in the British Museum. One of these additional Hymns is to Minerva, and the other is intitled *υμνος κοινος*.

## FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

*Contents of the 'Journal des Savans' for October, 1827.*

1. Asiatic Researches, or Transactions of the Society instituted in Bengal for inquiring into the History and Antiquities, the Arts, Sciences and Literature of Asia. [Article of M. Abel-Rémusat.]

2. Frid. Aug. Guil. Spohn . . . de lingua et literis veterum Ægyptiorum, cum permultis tabulis lithographicis, &c. Edidit et absolvit Gust. Seyffarth.—Gustavi Seyffarth Rudimenta Hieroglyphices.—Letter to the Duke de Blacas on the new Hieroglyphical System of Spohn and Seyffarth, by J. P. Champollion, jun. [2nd Article of the Baron Silvestre de Sacy.]

3. Le Roman du Renart, published from the manuscripts in the Royal Library at Paris of the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries, by M. O. M. Méon. [2nd Article of M. Raynouard.]

4. Papyri Græci regii Taurinensis Musei Ægypti editi atque illustrati ab Amedeo Peyron; pars prima. [M. Letronne.]

5. Memoir, or Notice on the real Author of the Imitation of J. C., by M. G. de Gregory. [M. Daunou.]

6. Literary news.

*November.*—1. Notice on the true Author of the Imitation of Jesus Christ. [2nd Article by M. G. de Gregory.]

2. De la Forme de la Poésie Hébraïque, with a Dissertation on Hebrew Music, by M. J. L. Saalschütz. [The Baron Silvestre de Sacy.]

3. Recherches sur la distribution géographique des Végétaux Phanérogames de l'ancien monde depuis l'Equateur jusqu'au Pôle Arctique, &c. by M. de Mirbel. [M. Abel-Rémusat.]

4. La Législation Civile, Commerciale et Criminelle de la France; ou Commentaire et Complément des Codes Français, &c. &c. by Baron Locré, vols. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. [M. Raynouard.]

5. Relation d'un Voyage dans la Marmarique et la Cyrénaïque, and in the Oases of Audgehah and of Maradéh, accompanied with geographical maps, &c. by M. J. R. Pachô. [M. Letronne.]

6. *La Chine : mœurs, usages, costumes, &c.* Monumens et Paysages, engraved after the original drawings by Father Castiglione, Wm. Alexander Chambers, &c. by MM. Devéria, Regnier, and other known artists; with explanatory notices, and an introduction, describing the present state of the Chinese Empire, &c. &c. by D. P. de Malpière. [M. Abel-Rémusat.]

7. Literary news.

*December.*—1. *Asiatic Researches, or Transactions, &c.* [2nd Article of the Baron de Sacy.]

2. *Lettres sur l'Histoire de France*, being an Introduction to the Study of that History, by M. Augustin Thierry. [M. Daunou.]

3. *Mélanges Asiatiques*; or a Selection of Criticisms and Notices relative to the Religions, Sciences, History and Geography of the Oriental Nations, by M. Abel-Rémusat. vols. 1st and 2nd. [Baron Silvestre de Sacy.]

4. *The Life of John Dryden*, containing the History of English Literature from the Death of Shakspeare until the year 1700, by Sir Walter Scott. [M. Raynouard.]

5. *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*, inde ab Anno Christi quingentesimo usque ad annum millesimum quingentesimum, edidit Georg. Henricus Pertz. [M. Daunou.]

6. Literary news.

The Class of Philosophy at Gottingen proposes two subjects for prizes for 1828.—1. *Ut doceatur, tum ex scriptoribus, Cicero in primis, Plutarcho, Pausania, aliis, tum ex monumentis et inscriptionibus (in collectione Berolinensi congestis), qualis fuerit status urbis Athenarum politicus et literarius sub Romanis, inde ab interitu fœderis Acharici usque ad Antoninorum tempora. Præmittatur, præmii loco, brevis historiæ urbis conspectus, ut quæ ei maxime secunda, quæ adversa evenerint, appareat. Explicetur sectione altera conditio scholarum tum publicarum tum privatarum. De ipsa literarum historia non quæritur.*—2. *Philosophorum Græcorum, in primis Platonis, Aristotelis ac Stoicorum, de justitia et jure opiniones et decreta, quonam potissimum differant ab iis quæ nostræ ætatis philosophis placuerunt?*

#### SELECTION OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*Nouvelle Géographie Méthodique*, for the instruction of Youth, by A. Michelot, formerly pupil at the Polytechnic Academy, and A. Meis: to which is added, a Treatise on the Construction of Maps, by M. Charles, geographer attached to the War-office, 1 vol. in 12mo., accompanied by an universal Atlas in folio, by the same M. Charles. The price of the vol. in 12mo. with 2 maps, is 2½ francs; the Atlas, containing in boards 6 maps, costs 7 francs; of 11 maps, 12½ francs; of 16 maps, 18 francs. The map of Africa

has been corrected by M. Jomard, that of America by M. J. Klaproth. The nomenclature has been submitted to the examination of MM. Abel-Rémusat and Saint Martin.

*Explication des Instituts de Justinien*, with the text and translation opposite each other, preceded by a summary of the Roman Law, by M. Ortolan, Advocate at the Royal Court, Paris, 1827. in 8vo.

*Initia Philosophiæ Platoniciæ*, auctore P. G. Van Heusde. Lovanii, 1827, in 8vo.

*Cours de Littérature Grecque Moderne*, delivered at Geneva by Jacovaky Rizo Neroulos, published by J. Humbert. Geneva, 1827, in 8vo.

*M. T. Ciceronis Opera Omnia*, ex recensione S. A. Ernesti, studiose recognita, edidit F. A. Nobbe. Lipsiæ, Tauchnitz, 1827, in 4to. maj. stereotype edition, of two columns, with a portrait of Cicero, engraved by Zschoch, after the Iconography of Visconti, price 7 rix-dollars 12 gr.

*Les Papyrus Egyptiens de la Bibliothèque du Vatican*. Leipsic. Heinrichs, 1827, in 8vo. with 3 plates, price 1 rix-dollar. This work is by M. Champollion, jun. It has been translated into Italian by M. Angelo Mai, and published at Rome; M. Buchman has translated it into German.

*Raymundi Cunichii Ragusini Epigrammata*, nunc primum in lucem edita. Ragusii, Martecchini, 1827, in 8vo.—Raymont Cunich, the Jesuit, is known by his translations of Homer and Theocritus into Latin verse.

*L'Eloge de la Folie, par Erasme*. The Praise of Folly, by Erasmus: a new translation into French, by C. B. de Panable, in 8vo. Paris, 1826.

This singular Latin work, to which Erasmus gave the Greek title of ΜΩΡΙΑΣ ΕΓΚΩΜΙΟΝ, has often been reprinted and translated into French. The witty and facetious author of this celebrated work composed it in England, and dedicated it to his friend the Lord Chancellor, Sir Thomas More, in 1509, in which he has given a free course to his gaiety. At the age of 42 years, he composed The Praise of Folly; having seen much, studied much, and having been, in spite of himself, both monk and priest.—It is written with inexhaustible spirit; the strokes of ridicule against folly are incomparable: he has made war against the vices of the world in such a distinguished manner, as to insure the continued success of this work. This new translation is, in general, a faithful and happy copy of the original, although at times it fails in the *vis comica*: the notes were indispensable in a work abounding, like this, in allusions to ancient history, as well as to the manners

of the age in which the author lived. The notice of Erasmus, which precedes this translation, fully acquaints us with the life and character of this profound and spiritual man : the work of M. Panable is therefore justly entitled to the encouragement and support of an enlightened public.

*History of the Ottoman Empire*, by J. de Hammer. (Vide *Class. Journ.* No. LXXI. p. 155.) The first vol. of the result of M. de Hammer's Travels in Asiatic and European Turkey has been published, and according to the prospectus, will be followed by a volume every eight months, till the six volumes in German are complete. We hope nothing will prevent the author from finishing a work so well begun, and which is certainly the most important that has ever been published on the Ottoman Empire.

*Thesauri Linguae Hebraicae et Mishnae augendi*; by A. F. Harthmann; Particula III. in 4to. Rostock, 1825—6. Adler.

The learned author of these three theses has for a long time occupied himself in the study of the Mishna, as far as regards its philological view. He has confined himself principally in comparing it to the works which relate to the Pentateuch. The three notices which we announce contain the result of his learned researches : they contain grammatical parallels and lexicographic materials, which enrich the Hebrew language. In his introduction, the author exposes the history of the origin of the collection of the Mishna : he then gives the true signification of this word, and shows the importance which this book ought to bear for the interpreters of the New Testament, and to such as study *fundamentally* the Judaic theology. We find in this work the Greek and Latin words which have been introduced into the Hebrew language; the Hebrew words which are found in the Mishna, but which are wanting in the Pentateuch; and lastly, the Hebrew words which are found in the Mishna and in the Pentateuch, but which differ in their form and signification.

*The Annals of Tabari*. (Vide *Class. Journ.* No. LXXI. p. 158.) Mr. Kosegarten invites subscriptions to these unpublished Arabian Annals by the amateurs of Oriental literature and historical writings, and likewise by the protectors of literature in general. This work is one of the most ancient and authentic histories transmitted to us by the Arabs. The celebrated work of Aboulfi'da, which is now generally used for the study of Oriental history, is in the first periods of the history nothing but a meagre extract of this work of *Tabari*. The manuscripts of the Arabian text are extremely rare; but there is one in the King's library at Berlin, in 4 large volumes, which begins with the Khalifat of Aboubker. This manuscript, which belonged formerly to the library of Atabek Togrulbeg, at Mosul, in the 6th century of the

Hejra, is the work from which the present translation will be made: its title is

تاريخ الملوك واعمارهم

و مواليد الرسل و انبايهم و الكاين الذي كان في زمن

كل واحد منهم تاليف ابي جعفر مكرم بن جرير بن يزيد  
الطبري\*

*L'Alphabet Européen appliqué aux Langues Asiatiques.* Simplification of Oriental Languages—the Hebrew simplified by the Alphabetic method, by Volney. 1 vol. in 8vo. Paris.

*Nouvelle Méthode pour étudier l'Hébreu des Saintes Ecritures;* followed by a History of Ruth, &c. by the Abbé Beuzelin. 1 vol. in 4mo.

*Le Coran, translated into French by Savary;* preceded by an account of Mahomet, by M. Colin de Plaucy; a new edition, in 2 vols. in 18mo. price 7½ francs.

*Prospectus et Specimen d'un Dictionnaire Français-Arabe, par M. Ellious Boethor:* revised and augmented by M. Caussin de Perceval, professor of Arabic at l'Ecole Royale des Langues Orientales vivantes, à Paris, and author of a grammar of that language. In 4to:—

*Yadjnabattabada, ou la mort de Yadjnadatta* (episode extracted from the *Ramayana*, a Sanscrit epic poem); the text, French translation, and grammatical analysis, by M. Chézy: to which is added, a literal translation in French, by M. J. L. Burnouf, professor at the Royal Collège of France. 1 vol. in 4to. with 15 plates. — This work has been published by the desire of the Asiatic Society of Paris; the plates have been given by M. Chézy.

*Essai sur le Pali, ou Langue Sacrée de la Presqu'île au-delà du Gange;* Essay on the Pali or Sacred Language of the Peninsula beyond the Ganges, by MM. Eugene, Burnouf, and Lassen. 1 vol. in 8vo. with 6 plates. — Published by order, and on account of the Société Asiatique of Paris. (A report of this work will be found in the *Journal Asiatique*, vol. 7. p. 358—370.)

*Dictionnaire Grec-Moderne-François,* by F. D. Deheque. 1 vol. in 16mo. 10 francs.

*L'Egypte sous les Pharaons;* or Researches on the Geography, the Religion, the Language, the Writings and History of Egypt, before the Invasion of Cambyzes, by M. Champollion, jun. 2 vols. in 8vo. 15 francs.

*Alcæi Mitylenæi Reliquiæ.*—Collegit et annotatione instruxit Matthiæ. In 8vo. Leipzig, 1827.

*Procopii Cæsariensis Anecdota, sive Historia arcana*, Græce ; ed. Orellii. Leipzig, 1827.

*Justini Historiæ Philippicæ*, ex recensione Abrah. Gronovii, et cum diversitate lectionis Græviæ accurate edidit Carolus Henricus Frotscher. 1 vol. in 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1827.

*Grammaire Française rédigée en Arabe*. French Grammar arranged in Arabic, by M. Garcin de Tassy. 1828.—This grammar has been composed by the desire of *Mehammed Ali, viceroy of Egypt* : it is to be printed at *Boulac*, near Cairo : the object of it is to teach the Arab subjects and allies of the Viceroy, French.

*Quæstiones Herodotæ, by Dr. Heyse*. Part 1. De vita et itineribus Herodoti : in 8vo. Berlin, 1827, Dümmler. The author, dissatisfied with the works hitherto published respecting Herodotus, has added to them this : the first section treats, de Herodoti anno natali (484 years before J. C. six years after the battle of Marathon), patria (Halicarnassus), cognatis, deque ineunte ejus ætate. 2. De recitatione, quam Olympiæ habuisse fertur Herodotus, Ol. 81. 3. Vitæ decursus usque ad Ol. 84. De recitatione Athenis habita, deque commercio quod intercessisse fertur Herodoto cum Corinthiis et Bæotis. 4. De Colonia Thurios deducta (444 years before J. C. according to Larcher, and 446 years before J. C. according to other writers). 5. De itineribus Herodoti.

*Quinti Ennii Annalium Lib. xviii. Fragmenta*, post Pauli Merulæ curas iterum recensita, auctiora, reconcinnata et illustrata. Accedunt Cn. Nævii librorum de bello Punico fragmenta collecta, composita et illustrata opera et studio E. S. In 8vo. Leipzig. Hahu, 1826.

*Discorso su Caronda da Catana e le di lui Leggi*, dal C. G. Alessi. Catania, 1826. 8vo.

*Poeticæ Aristotelis Nova Versio ex Græco exemplari editionis novissimæ haud paucis tamen in locis, si diis placet, emendato*. By M. Haus. Panormi, 1815. 8vo.

*Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi*, publiés par l'Institut Royal de France, T. xi. Paris, 1827, 4to.

*Contents* :—Pièces diplomatiques tirées des archives de la république de Gênes, par M. S. de Sacy.—Décret ou privilège de Léon III. roi d'Arménie, en faveur des Génois, en l'année 1288, par M. J. de St. Martin.—Notice sur l'Encyclopédie Japonaise, par M. A. Rémusat.—Notice d'un manuscrit Espagnol écrit pour l'usage des Mauser, &c., par M. S. de Sacy.—Notice des lettres inédites de Crates ; Notice des Scholies inédites de Basile sur S. Grégoire de Nazianze ; Traité alimentaire du médecin Hiérophile, par M. Boissonade.—Notice d'un manuscrit du Chevalier Cotton, par M. Brial.—Notice d'une histoire inédite de la Moldavie, composée en Moldave, par N. Costin, et traduite en Grec moderne, par A. Amiras, par M. Hase.

*La Vénus de Paphos et son Temple*, par J. D. Guigniaut. Paris, 1827. in 8vo. (an illustration of Tacitus Histof. II. 2—4.)



*J. M. A. Scholz Commentatio de Golgothæ et Sanctissimi D. N. J. C. sepulchri situ.* Bonnæ, 1825. 4to.

*Histoire et Mémoires de l'Institut Royal de France ; Académie des Inscriptions*, tome viii.

*Contents*.—Recherches sur l'origine et la formation de l'écriture Chinoise, par A. M. Rémusat; Remarques sur quelques écritures syllabiques tirées des caractères Chinois, et sur le passage de l'écriture figurée à l'écriture syllabique, par le même; Remarques sur l'extension de l'Empire Chinois, par le même; Examen du texte de Diodore de Sicile relatif au monument d'Osymandias, par M. Gail; Mémoire sur l'état fédératif des Béotiens, par M. R. Rochette; Mémoire sur l'origine des jeux Sténiques chez les Romains, et sur les lois qui en réglèrent la discipline; Observations sur les tables récemment attribuées à Phédre, par M. Vanderbourg; Mémoire sur le bronze des Anciens, par M. Mongez; Mémoire sur les trois plus grands camées antiques, par le même; De l'état des personnes en France sous les rois de la première race, par M. Naudet, &c. &c. &c. Ἀββιανοῦ τῶν Ἐπιτετήτων Διατριβῶν βιβλία τέσσαρα, ἐκδότος καὶ διορθώσαντος Α. Κ. Paris 1827. 8vo. (The editor is the learned Dr. Coray.)

Proposals for publishing, *Letters, Critical, Philological, and Literary*, from eminent scholars of the eighteenth century, to the Rev. Jonathan Toup, A.M. author of 'Emendationes in Suidam et Hesychium,' and editor of 'Longinus,' 'Theocritus,' &c. Now first printed from the autographs, with biographical and historical illustrations, by EDWARD RICHARD POOLE, B.A. Trin. Hall, Camb.; and Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, London.

In addition to the correspondence of the Rev. Mr. Toup's learned friends, which will constitute the bulk of the volume, *eight* letters from Dr. Stafford Price to Dr. Z. Pearce, Bishop of Rochester, the well known editor of Longinus, will be appended. They seem to have been addressed to the Bishop at his request, and on the occasion of an amended edition of the treatise DE SUBLIMITATE: the critical information contained in them is very considerable, and in a measure wholly new; since, notwithstanding the high opinion the Reverend and Learned Bishop entertained and expressed of their contents on sending them to Mr. TOUR, when he was engaged on his edition of Longinus, it is somewhat singular, that neither Editor has incorporated any portion of them, worthy of notice, in either their conjectural or critical emendations.

The Editor is aware that publications of this nature command but a very limited circulation: he therefore intends to print only so many copies as may be subscribed for; and should an adequate number of names be received by the 25th of the ensuing June, the work will be put to press immediately, otherwise the idea, however reluctantly, must be abandoned.

Under these circumstances, it will be obvious that it is utterly impossible to affix any definite price to the volume. The Editor is willing to state, as a MAXIMUM, that it shall not exceed ONE GUINEA, and he hopes that it will not amount to near that sum; this must, however, depend intirely on the reception this Prospectus receives at the hands of the learned.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

We have received some Reviews, which are unavoidably postponed.

An Oxonian will perceive that we intend to give the essence of the 'Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum' in our future Numbers.

---

### [ADVERTISEMENT.]

This day is published, and to be had Gratis,  
**A CATALOGUE OF SECOND-HAND BOOKS ;**  
Being the Stock of RICHARD PRIESTLEY,  
Now selling by his Assignees for Ready Money only, on the Premises,  
143, High Holborn.

To Collectors of Classics, Oriental Works, Dictionaries, &c. this Catalogue is peculiarly worthy of attention, as it contains many scarce and valuable works marked at uncommonly low prices, and the sale on these terms can only continue for a very *short* period.

---

### *Just Published.*

In 12mo. price 6s. 6d. bound,  
**RULES AND EXERCISES IN HOMERIC  
AND ATTIC GREEK.**

To which is added,  
**A SHORT SYSTEM OF GREEK PROSODY.**

For the Use of the Second and Senior Greek Classes in the University of Glasgow. By D. K. SANDFORD, Esq. A. M. Oxon, Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow. Printed for WILLIAM BLACKWOOD, Edinburgh; and T. CADELL, Strand, London.

Of whom may be had, by the same Author,  
For the Use of the Junior Greek Class in the University  
of Glasgow,

**I. EXTRACTS from GREEK AUTHORS, with Notes and a Vocabulary.** Second Edition, corrected and improved. 8vo. 7s. bound.

**II. INTRODUCTION to the WRITING of GREEK.** Third Edition. 12mo. 3s. 6d. bound.

This day is published, in one vol. 8vo. Price 6s. boards,

# CLAVIS GYMNASII,

Editioni Tertiæ accommodata, sive EXERCITATIONES in Symbolam  
Criticam, partim, sicut in veteribus extant, datæ, et partim à

REV. ALEX. CROMBIE, LL. D.

Latine redditæ.

Londini: R. Hunter, ad ædem Divi Pauli.

Where may be had, lately published, by the same Author, in 2 vols.

8vo. price 21s. boards,

GYMNASIUM, sive Symbola Critica.

The Third Edition, corrected and enlarged.

This day is published, in post 8vo. Price 8s.

# AN INQUIRY INTO THE STRUCTURE

AND AFFINITY OF

# THE GREEK AND LATIN LANGUAGES.

With occasional comparisons of the Sanscrit and Gothic; and  
an Appendix, in which the Derivation of the Sanscrit from the  
Greek is endeavored to be established. By GEORGE DUNBAR,  
F.R.S.E., and Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh.  
Printed for WILLIAM BLACKWOOD, Edinburgh; and T.  
CADELL, Strand, London.

## ERRATA IN NO. LXXI.

Page 112, line 21, for *dietics* read *dirtetics*.

note 1, for *roasted* read *boiled*.

4, for *coctura* read *coction*.

113, line 3 from bottom, for *passages* read *passage*.

115, line 4, for *we* read *he*.

THE  
CLASSICAL JOURNAL;  
N<sup>o</sup>. LXXIV.

JUNE, 1828.

---

DE VENTIS.

---

It appears to have been a custom among the ancients, to recite the works both of poets and historians (during their banquets) in Latin and Greek. An instance occurs in Senec. Epist. 64. where amongst other things are these words, "*Varius nobis sermo fuit in convivio. Lectus est deinde liber 2. Sextii patris, magni viri et Stoici.*" It appears also, according to Pliny, that slaves were brought up to the performance of this duty, from which they received the name *Anagnostas*. It happened, however, once at the table of Favorinus, during the recital of some Latin poet, that the wind lapyx was introduced; and on an inquiry being made into the nature and destiny of that wind, Favorinus explained at length what they desired to know. From the circumstance of the lapyx being introduced in a Latin poet, it is more than likely that Horace was the author, where he says, "*Obstrictis aliis, præter lapyga.*" Favorinus divides the heavens into four boundaries, or poles; viz. 1. Exortum, 2. Occasum, 3. Meridiem, 4. Septemtriones. With respect to this fourth division, some doubt is attached as to its true etymology. Some are of opinion that *triones* is a mere supplementary word to the term *septem*, without having any meaning attached to it; but, in conjunction with Ælius and Varro, I am inclined to think that the true composition is *septem*, alluding to the seven stars seen in the North, called by astronomers *Plaustrum*, and *terriones*, or rather *teriones* (quod terram terant), relating to the oxen which are fit for turning up the

earth. To proceed however, the *exortus* and *occasus* are the moveable, whilst the *meridies* and *septentriones* are the permanent or fixed poles. For since the sun does not always rise in the same place, for the same reason it cannot always set in the same place: the terms given to the risings and settings of the sun are, *Æquinoctialis*, when it runs in a circle, (ισημερινός,) *Solstitialis*, or *Brumalis*. The wind then which “ab oriente verno, id est Æquinoctiali, venit,” is called *Eurus*, named so, according to etymologists, ἀπὸ τῆς ἡοῦς ῥέων. That which blows “ab æstiva, et solstitiali orientis meta venit,” is called *Aquilo*, Græcè *Boreas*, named so ἀπὸ τῆς βοῆς. The third wind, which blows “ab oriente brumali,” is called *Vulturnus*. There are therefore three *Venti orientales*: 1. *Aquilo*; 2. *Vulturnus*; 3. *Eurus*: of which the *Eurus* is the middle wind. Opposed to the three *Orientales venti*, are three *Occidui venti*: 1. *Caurus*, which the Greeks call ἀγερτής, blowing in opposition to the *Aquilo*; 2. *Favonius* (ζέφυρος), opposed to the *Eurus*; 3. *Africus* (λίψ), opposed to the *Vulturnus*. But an objection is made to this arrangement, if we refer to the Odes of Horace, lib. i. 3. where he says,

————— Nec timuit Africum  
Decertantem Aquilonibus, &c.

This passage will help to support the idea, that the names are often confounded, and used without any particular reference. The *Meridies*, being a fixed, stationary pole, has but one wind, called *Auster*, Græcè νότος (νότις signifying moisture). For the same reason the *Septentriones*, being a fixed pole, has but one wind, called *Septentrionarius*, Græcè ἀπαρκτία. From these eight winds, some subtract four: Homer appears to have done this, acknowledging *Eurus*, *Auster*, *Aquilo*, *Favonius*. The passage I quote runs thus,

Σὺν δ' εὐρός τ' ἔπρεσε, ζέφυρός τε, νότος τε δυσαῆς,  
Καὶ βορέης αἰθρηγενέτης μέγα κύμα κυλίνδων.

Aristotle, Pol. iv. c. 4. seems to have mentioned but two, the *Australem* and *Septentrionalem*, with regard to the *Arctic* and *Antarctic Pole*.

The more modern division of the winds, as given by the celebrated Bacon, may be inserted with propriety. He divides them into—1. *Cardinales*, as blowing from pole to pole; 2. *Senicardinales*, as traversing normally with respect to the *Cardinales*; 3. *Mediani*, as blowing between the *Cardinales* and

*Semicardinales*, and several other smaller divisions, which are here subjoined.

## CARDINALES.

*Boreas.*

*Bor.* 1 ad Eurus.

Med. Mag.

*Bor.* 2 ad Eurus, sive Aquilo,

*Bor.* 3 ad Eurus, sive Meses.

Semicar.

*Euro-Boreas.*

*Eurus* 1 a Borea.

Med. Mag.

*Eurus* 2 a *Bor.*, sive Cæcias.

*Eurus* 3 a *Bor.*

## CARDINALES.

*Auster*, sive Notus.

*Auster* 1 ad Zephyrum.

Med. Mag.

*Auster* 2 ad Zephyrum, sive Libonotus.

*Auster* 3 ad Zephyrum.

Semicar.

*Zephyro-Auster*, sive Libs.

*Zephyrus* 1 ab Austro.

Med. Mag.

*Zephyrus* 2 ab Austro, sive Africus.

*Zephyrus* 3 ab Austro.

## CARDINALES.

*Eurus*, sive Subsolanus.

*Eurus* 1 ad Austrum.

Med. Mag.

*Eurus* 2 ad Austrum, sive Vultur-  
turnus.

*Eurus* 3 ad Austrum.

Semicar.

*Euro-Auster.*

*Auster* 1 ab Euro.

Med. Mag.

*Auster* 2 ab Euro, sive Phœn-  
cias.

*Auster* 3 ab Euro.

## CARDINALES.

*Zephyrus*, sive Favonius.

*Zephyrus* 1 ad Boream.

Med. Mag.

*Zephyrus* 2 ad Boream, sive  
Corus.

*Zephyrus* 3 ad Boream.

Semicar.

*Zephyro-Boreas.*

*Boreas* 1 a *Zephyro*, sive Thra-  
scias.

Med. Mag.

*Boreas* 2 a *Zephyro*, sive Cir-  
cius.

*Boreas* 3 a *Zephyro*.

There are also other names given to the winds, such as *Apheliotes*, *Argestes*, *Olympias*, *Sciron*, *Hellespontius*, *Iapyx*, &c. It would be too lengthened a subject to treat of the physical causes by which the various wind. are produced, as also of the superstitions which existed among the ancients concerning them; but these must form another paper. I will, however, subjoin the most modern division of the winds, together with the account given of them by Vitruvius.

English.	Latin and Greek.	Distance of points from North.
1. North.	Septentrio, or Boreas.	0° 0'
2. N. by E.	Hyperboreas, Hyppaquilo, Gallicus.	11 15
3. N. N. E.	Aquilo.	22 30
4. N. E. by N.	Mesoboreas, Mesaquilo, Supernas.	33 45
5. N. E.	Arctapeliotes, Rotapeliotes, Græcus.	45
6. N. E. by E.	Hypocæsius.	56 15
7. E. N. E.	Cæsius, Hellespontius.	67 30
8. E. by N.	Mesocæsius, Carbas.	78 45
9. East.	Solanus, Subsolanus, Apeliotes.	From East. 0° 0'
10. E. by S.	Eurus.	11 15
11. E. S. E.	Eurus, Voltumnus.	22 30
12. S. E. by E.	Mesurus.	33 45
13. S. E.	Notapeliotes, Euro-Auster.	45
14. S. E. by S.	Hypophœnix.	56 15
15. S. S. E.	Phoenix, Phœnicias, Leuco-Notus, Gangeticus.	67 30
16. S. by E.	Mesophœnix	78 45
17. South.	Auster, Meridies, Notus.	From South. 0° 0'
18. S. by W.	Hypolibonotus, Altanus.	11 15
19. S. S. W.	Libonotus, NotoLibycus, Austro-Africus.	22 30
20. S. W. by S.	Mesolibonotus.	33 45
21. S. W.	Noto-Zephyrus, Noto-Libycus, Africus.	45
22. S. W. by W.	Hypolibs, Hypafricus, Subvesperus.	56 15
23. W. S. W.	Libs.	67 30
24. W. by S.	Mesolibs, Meso-Zephyrus.	78 45
25. West.	Zephyrus, Favonius, Occidens.	From West. 0° 0'
26. W. by N.	Hypargestes, Hypocorus.	11 15
27. W. N. W.	Argestes, Caurus, Corus, Iapyx.	22 30
28. N. W. by W.	Mesargestes, Meso-Corus.	33 45
29. N. W.	ZephyroBoreas, BoreoLibycus, Olympias.	45
30. N. W. by N.	Hypocircius, Hypothrascias, Sciron.	56 15
31. N. N. W.	Circius, Thrascias.	67 30
32. N. by W.	Meso-Circius.	78 45

*Note.*—The ancient names after Ricciolus are here adapted to the modern ones, not that they will be found to correspond in every respect with each other; for the ancient and modern divisions being different, the points will also differ: these are, however, those which agree the nearest. Thus Vitruvius, reckoning but twenty-four winds, disposes the points in different order, as follows:—

Names of Winds.	Distance from North.	Names of Winds.	Distance from East.
1. Septentrio.	0° 0'	7. Solanus.	0° 0'
2. Gallicus.	15	8. Ornithias.	15
3. Supernas.	30	9. Cacias.	30
4. Aquilo.	45	10. Eurus.	45
5. Boreas.	60	11. Voltarnus.	60
6. Carbas.	75	12. Euronotus.	75
Names of Winds.	Distance from South.	Names of Winds.	Distance from West.
13. Auster.	0° 0'	19. Favonius.	0° 0'
14. Altanus.	15	20. Mesia.	15
15. Libonotus.	30	21. Cirrus.	30
16. Africus.	45	22. Caurus.	45
17. Subvesper.	60	23. Corus.	60
18. Argestes.	75	24. Thrascias.	75

Greenwich Park.

H. TAYLOR.

## AN INQUIRY

*Into the Credit due to DIONYSIUS of HALICARNASSUS as a Critic and Historian;—By the Author of ‘Remarks on the supposed Dionysius Longinus.’*

[Continued from No. LXXII.]

Ἀρκαδίην μ' αἰτεῖς ; μέγα μ' αἰτεῖς· οὗ τοι δώσω.  
 Πολλοὶ ἐν Ἀρκαδίῃ βαλανηφάγοι ἄνδρες ἔασιν,  
 οἳ σ' ἀποκωλύσουσιν.—Herod. lib. i. c. 66.

THAT the Arcadians fitted out a fleet seventeen generations before the Trojan war; that some established themselves on the eastern, and some on the western coasts of Italy; and that the Aborigines of Latium were the descendants of these Arcadians, are fictions which should have found no place in history. But *Mirum est*, says the elder Pliny, *quo procedat Græca credulitas! Nullum est tam impudens mendacium, ut teste careat.* It is of these materials that Dionysius has formed a long and inconsistent story, in the discredit of which he has endeavored to involve the Roman historians; and to which he has so far given the appearance of truth, as to impose on Larcher, the very diligent, and in many respects the very able translator of Herodotus.



On this account the minuteness of my remarks will perhaps be excused, and the subject itself may be thought not unworthy of examination.

“Æzeüs and Phoroneus,” says Dionysius, “were the first who possessed power in Peloponnesus.” A short but perplexing statement : for we cannot imagine that these two were joint rulers over the whole of Peloponnesus ; and he has neither informed us in what part of it they ruled, nor what name it then bore, nor how they acquired their power. No notice is taken of Inachus ; but the omission may be justified, as the name belongs more properly to a river, or a river-god, than to the supposed king of Argos ; and that the Greeks imagined Phoroneus to be the first man, may be asserted on the authority not merely of the Phoronis, but apparently on that of Plato : for if the account which Critias the grandfather gave of Solon’s interview with the priests of Sais may not altogether warrant Mitford’s assertion, “we have indeed Plato’s testimony, that earlier than the age of Phoroneus nothing was known of Greece ;”—yet the words . . . τὰ ἀρχαιότατα λέγειν ἐπιχειρεῖν περὶ Φωρωνέως τε τοῦ πρώτου λεχθέντος . . . may be considered as agreeing with the opinion of the author of the dialogue.

But who was Æzeüs ? “De Æzeis,” says Sylburgius, “nihil usquam reperiri, quare suspicari liceat pro Αἰζεῖος et Αἰζεῖοι scribendum esse Ἀζῆν et Ἀζήνες, vel Dorico more Ἀζάν et Ἀζάνες : nam Pausanias et Stephanus Byz. tradunt Azanem fuisse Arcadis ex Eratone Nymphæ filium, et regionem illi a patre assignatam nominatam fuisse Azaniam, subditosque Azanes.”

Although Dionysius has not mentioned in what part of Peloponnesus this Æzeüs reigned, yet by asserting that the Cœnotri were an Arcadian colony, and that they were successively called Æzei, Lycaones, and Cœnotri, he authorises our making Æzeüs king of Arcadia ; and Strabo’s opinion is in favor of the very great antiquity of the Azanes : but we must nevertheless reject the suggestion of Sylburgius, for we cannot make the son of Arcas cotemporary with Phoroneus. According to Mitford, “the more probable tradition, concerning the origin of Sicyon, supposed its founder Ægialeus cotemporary and even brother of Phoroneus ;” and the Arcadian town Phegeia is said by Pausanias to have been so called from its founder Phegeus, the brother of Phoroneus.

Apis is also said to have been another brother of Phoroneus ; and Homer, Æschylus, Sophocles, and Strabo, as well as Pausanias, Eustathius, Stephanus Byzantinus, and the Scholiast on Thucydides, &c. may be cited to prove that Apia was the more

ancient name of Peloponnesus. We may add, too, that the Arcadians were called Apidones from Apidon, a son of Phoroneus, according to Stephanus; and the change of Æzeüs into Apis, or Apidon, will by no means overstep the modesty of verbal criticism. But it should be stated likewise, that the river Apidon has an equal, or, if we are to be guided by priority of mention, a greater claim to the honor of giving a name to the Arcadians: that, according to an author whom Stephanus and Athenæus have thought it worth while to quote, pear-trees, and not a man, gave rise to the name of Apia: that the result of Heyne's research is, "*Scilicet Apia tantum poëtarum nomen factum, nunquam geographicum nomen fuit; uti plura sunt terrarum nomina, quæ tantum in poëtis occurrunt, vere in hominum usu nunquam fuerunt. Itaque non sunt probandi, qui cum Scholiast. Thucyd. l. 9. antiquius nomen *Apian* fuisse aiunt, mutatum post Pelopem in Peloponnesum:*" finally, that, according to the Sicyonian account given by Pausanias, Apis was not the son of Phoroneus, but of Telchis, and the great-grandson of Ægialeus: that, according to Æschylus, the name Apia was derived from a physician, the son of Apollo, who came from Naupactum; and that not Arcadia, but Argos, was originally called Apia: and, finally, that Homer, and Strabo in his notice of the *Ἀπὶ γαῖα* of Homer, gives us no warrant for asserting the existence of this Apis, whether he be called the son of Telchis, or of Phoroneus, or of Apollo.

The unauthorised and unsupported assertion of Dionysius is therefore our only resource. We must take his bare word for the existence of a chief cotemporary with Phoroneus, and not less powerful than he: for this Æzeüs is mentioned before Phoroneus, and his subjects were called Æzei from him; and we do not learn from history that Phoroneus gave name to any nation.

As chronologists have thought fit to furnish us with two Cretan kings of the name of Minos,—“two extraordinary personages, kings of Elis, of the name of Iphitus—two extraordinary personages of the name of Lycurgus, legislators of Sparta, and so of many others,”—we need not wonder greatly at the two Lycaons of our historian. To the second he gives twelve sons; the first appears to have had

But one fair daughter, and no more,  
The which he loved passing well.

But whether the natives took their name of Lycaones from the first or second Lycaon, is a point which our historian has left us to settle for ourselves. As, however, no writer prior to Dionysius appears to have mentioned more than one Lycaon

the son of Pelagus, and as Pausanias, who was later than Dionysius, and not much inclined to scepticism, mentions no other, we may let Æzeüs and Lycaon the 1st flourish and fall together, an imaginary father and an imaginary son, and pass on to Deianira, the princess-royal and heiress, as it should seem, of Arcadia: for the second Lycaon, that is, the Lycaon of history, must have been king of that country; and we are told that he was the son of Deianira, by Pelagus the son of Jupiter and Niobe, and grandson of Phoroneus; and as nothing is said of invasion and conquest, we may conclude that Lycaon inherited the kingdom in right of his mother's, rather than of his father's family: for Phoroneus was king of Argos, and his daughter's intercourse with Jupiter is not tantamount to a settlement in Arcadia.

Of Pelagus, the grandson of the first king of Argos, and the earliest of all the sons of Jupiter by a human mother, Dionysius has said very little, and yet that little must be questioned. The parentage of Pelagus implies a very high antiquity; but if the five ages of Hesiod may be considered as partaking of the character of history, or as representing with some degree of truth the opinions which then prevailed, Pelagus cannot be placed in the three first ages, but must belong to that which Hesiod calls 'the heroic age,' and which he appears to make not much earlier than the Theban war. Now, according to Dionysius, the grandson of Pelagus emigrated seventeen generations before the Trojan war, and consequently Pelagus himself must be supposed to have flourished eighteen generations earlier than the date of the earliest exploit which Hesiod attributes to the heroic age.

The Arcadians, however,

— καὶ πρόσθε σελαιναίης ὑδέονται  
Ζώειν—

so that we must at least allow them a claim to be the most ancient of all nations. But where are we to find a recognition of this claim? Not in Homer, nor in Pindar, nor in Herodotus, nor in Thucydides, nor in Polybius. If the Scholiast on Aristophanes has quoted Aristotle with any correctness, that great philosopher gave a very simple explanation of a very absurd story, by stating in his account of Tegea, that barbarians formerly inhabited Arcadia, and that they were driven out by the then Arcadians' before the rising of the moon, on which account the Arcadians were called *Προσέληνοι*.

---

1 'Τὰ τῶν Ἀρκάδων, i. e. by the ancestors of those, who then inhabited Arcadia.

But the very antiquity which the Arcadians claimed is adverse to Dionysius. Pausanias tells us in his fifth book, that the Arcadians were autochthones, and that from their origin to his time they inhabited the same country. In his eighth book, where he treats expressly of Arcadia, he tells us, "The Arcadians say that Pelasgus was the first native of this country; but apparently others were cotemporary with him, for otherwise what subjects would he have had? Pelasgus was superior in mind and body to the others; and it seems to me, that he was therefore chosen king by them. 'The black earth,' says Asius, 'brought forth the godlike Pelasgus in the high-wooded mountains, that there might be a race of mortals.'"

But Pelasgus, when king, contrived both hûts, so that men might not be injured by the cold, or wet, or heat, and also garments of hog-skin, such as are still worn by the poor in Eubœa and Phœcis. He also made men leave off eating green leaves, and grasses, and roots, and brought the acorn of the evergreen oak into use as a nourishment: and so long did some continue to use this food, that the Pythia described the Arcadians as acorn-eaters, in her answer to the Lacedæmonians. It is said that in his reign the country was called Pelasgia.

Such is in substance the account given of Pelasgus by Pausanias; an author later, but not much later, than Dionysius, one therefore who would have read what Dionysius had written if it had been worth reading, and noticed it if he had thought it true. We find nothing about Æzeüs and Lycaon the 1st, nor about the Æzei and Lycaones; and we are told of only one Pelasgus, though Dionysius throws doublets again, and indulges us with two, one the son of Jupiter, and the other the son of Neptune.

"Toutes les traditions," says Larcher, "quoique différentes entre elles, s'accordent cependant à dire que Pélasgus étoit Argien. Voici de quelle manière s'exprime le Scholiaste d'Euripide sur le vers 1646 de l'Oreste: 'Pélasgus étoit autochthone Argien, fils d'Arestor, et petit-fils d'Iasus. Étant venu en Arcadie, il changea le caractère féroce des habitans et leur donna des mœurs plus douces.'"

That the traditions do not altogether agree with each other is evident from the parentage of Pelasgus; but that they coincide

---

<sup>1</sup> I have given the text of Kuhnus; but 'Ασίω is probably a corruption of 'Ησιόδω. Apollodorus, (if I recollect right,) after stating that Pelasgus was the son of Jupiter and Niobe according to Acusilaus, mentions, and afterwards repeats, that, according to Hesiod, Pelasgus was an αὐτόχθων.

in making him an Argive, may be denied from what Pausanias has told us ; and Dionysius also, when he mentions the Pelasgi as autochthones of Argos, mentions it not as the assertion of all, but of the generality.

“J’ai ajouté deux chapitres,” says Larcher in the preface to his Herodotus, “l’un sur les Pélasges, l’autre sur les Rois de Lacédémone. Hérodote parle en plusieurs endroits des Pélasges et de leur différentes migrations ; mais ce qu’il en dit ne suffisant pas pour se former une idée juste de ce peuple errant et vagabond, j’ai rassemblé en un seul corps tout ce que nous en ont appris les anciens, et j’ai eu soin de marquer, autant que la disette des monumens me l’a permis, les différentes époques de ses migrations ; ce qui répandra un grand jour sur l’histoire de ce peuple. Saumaise, MM. Geinoz et De la Nauze avoient traité ce sujet avant moi, le premier *De Hellenisticâ*, et les deux autres dans les Mémoires de l’Académie des Belles-Lettres. Je n’ai voulu lire leurs ouvrages qu’après avoir composé ce chapitre, de crainte de me laisser préoccuper. Mais après l’avoir achevé, ayant fait une lecture attentive des Mémoires de ces deux Savans, et de ce qu’en a dit Saumaise, j’ai persisté dans mon sentiment. M. Dupuis a traité le même sujet dans le second volume des Mémoires de l’Institut National de France. Son Mémoire, bien loin de me faire changer d’opinion, me confirme encore plus dans celle que j’ai embrassée.”

In the *avertissement* to his *Canon Chronologique* he again notices the subject. “Les Pélasges,” as he tells us, “ont joué anciennement un rôle considérable, et Hérodote en fait lui-même assez souvent mention. J’avois négligé d’en parler dans ma première édition. Dans celle-ci je les ai suivis dans toutes leurs migrations, depuis leur origine jusqu’à leur extinction. Cela étoit d’autant plus nécessaire que ce sujet n’avoit point été traité, à ce qu’il me semble, d’une manière convenable, et qu’il n’avoit pas été envisagé sous son vrai point de vue. Cette partie de l’histoire ancienne m’a paru si importante, que j’en ai fait un article séparé dans mon *Essai de Chronologie*.”

The industry of Larcher has, I fear, been misplaced, and his chronological canon is but a laborious failure. He has ransacked the rag-fair of antiquity, and made his patchwork appear pleasing to the eye ; but, like our own Bryant, he has thought that to be a duty which is “more honored in the breach than the observance ;” he has relied on authors who are of no authority, and has not considered that the silence of Herodotus and Thucydides may be sufficient to disprove the assertions of a hundred sophists. Pelasgius, as he informs us, reigned twenty years in

Arcadia, "et même il y eut un fils nommé Lycaon. Mais soit que ce prince fût choqué des mœurs agrestes du peuple nouvellement conquis, soit que le climat lui déplût, soit inconstance et légèreté dans son caractère, il chercha à se fixer ailleurs. Pendant qu'il délibéroit sur quel pays il porteroit ses pas, on lui annonça que la Thessalie, qui jusqu'alors avoit été sous les eaux, venoit d'éprouver un tremblement de terre. Ce tremblement avoit été si violent que le mont Ossa avoit été séparé de l'Olympe. Les eaux, qui inondoient cette belle contrée, s'étant écoulées par cette ouverture, le pays fut bientôt desséché, et l'on n'aperçut plus que des campagnes immenses, qui invitoient les peuples voisins à les venir cultiver. Pélasgus profita d'autant plus volontiers de cette heureuse rencontre, qu'il se promettoit d'amples moissons d'une terre encore vierge, dont personne ne songeoit à lui disputer la possession. Son fils Lycaon, étant encore trop jeune pour le suivre, il le laissa en Arcadie, et prenant avec lui les Pélasges aventuriers, il se rendit dans l'Hæmonie."

"Multum interest, utrum rem ipsam an libros inspicias." A maxim which we must not forget when we read Dionysius, and which in the present instance may be applied to Larcher; for there is reason to suspect that in his chronological essays "he draweth the thread of his verbosity finer than the staple of his argument," and that the web of history must be woven of better materials than can be collected from Athenæus and Dionysius.

That the natives of an inland and woody and mountainous country were not gentle in their manners, and that the climate was disagreeable, is more than probable; and perhaps the description which Strabo gives of the Corsican highlanders may be well applied to the early Arcadians. But if we are content to rely on Polybius, supposition seems unnecessary. That excellent author may be thought by some to attribute too much to the influence of climate and music; but they who doubt his inferences will yet allow, that he who was an Arcadian by birth, and who bore so high a character for veracity, may be trusted in his statements of facts, and the τῶν ἡθῶν αὐστηρίαν, and the τοῦ περιέχοντος ψυχρότητα καὶ στυγνότητα τὴν κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον ἐν τοῖς τόποις ὑπάρχουσαν, which in his opinion induced the οἱ πάλαι to make music a part of education, added to the τοὺς πρώτους Ἀρκάδων . . . τὰλλα τοῖς βίοις ὄντας αὐστηροτάτους of an earlier passage, will justify Larcher's hints about the rustic manners of the natives and the unpleasantness of the climate. But Pelasgus was a conqueror; and the adventurers, at whose head he placed

himself, if not such as an

o'erclroyed country vomits forth  
To desperate ventures,

were not much superior to the Arcadians in civilisation; nor were the unresisting Arcadians so obtrusive, as to oblige their conqueror to exchange the vales of Arcady for the dried-up marshes of Thessaly, that he might the more quietly enjoy the company of his fellow-adventurers. As to climate, the change was hardly worth the while. As to the fickleness of Pelasgus, his reigning twenty years in Arcadia is no proof of it; and if Lycaen was too young to follow his father, he was probably too young to be left behind as a monarch of barbarians. As for the "*amples moissons d'une terre encore vierge*," he, who had taught the Arcadians to feed on acorns, was not very likely to anticipate Triptolemus; neither could his residence in Arcadia have led him to expect that a land "*encore vierge*" would produce "*d'amples moissons*" of itself.

But on what foundation has Larcher raised so strange a superstructure? A passage which Athenæus quotes from Bato the rhetorician of Sinope, and "*une tradition constante que Pélasgus étoit venu dans ce pays avec des Arcadiens. Car Apollonius de Rhodes dit qu'Aristée quitta la Phthie par l'ordre de son père Apollon, et qu'il se transporta dans l'île de Céos avec des Arcadiens descendans de Lycaon, qu'il avoit rassemblés.*" As to the tradition, Larcher himself tells us that Lycaon remained in Arcadia; and if a passage from Bato found in Athenæus is to be received as part of history, we may still be allowed to doubt the probability of the circumstances. The long journey of Pelorus seems to have had little or no motive. Bœotia was inhabited by different tribes of barbarians in early times; yet Pelorus seems to have been in no danger. Pelasgus, according to Larcher, took possession of the dried-up lake without obstruction; and might, as it seems, have established himself without much trouble in districts nearer home.

Finally, does the text of Athenæus warrant the assertions of Larcher? Does τῷ Πελασγῷ necessarily mean Pelasgus king of Arcadia? or is there any thing else in the passage which authorises us to assert that Pelorus came from Thessaly to Arcadia?

T.

## A Hint towards the Correction of a Passage in Æschylus.

*Τυφῶνα θούρον, ὅστις ἀντέστη θεοῖς.*

"ITA Gaisfordius, probante Porsono," says the Bishop of Chester. So that the line, as the Quarterly Reviewer observes, "is at last free from a most offensive anapæst in the fourth place : before this edition it was read, *Τυφῶνα θούρον πᾶσιν ὃς ἀντέστη θεοῖς.*" "Multa scriptorum loca e schedis Porsoni indicat B.," says the Edinburgh Reviewer, "in qua πᾶς perperam a librariis invectum sit. Quanquam fatendum est, nonnihil de vi sententiæ ablatum iri, si a nostro loco ejiciatur. Emendabat Elmsleius ad Aristoph. Ach. 1082. *Τυφῶν, ἅπασιν ὅστις ἀντέστη θεοῖς.* sed recte monet B. vocem θούρον pro libriorum additamento vix haberi posse." Now, in an author whom Æschylus was very fond of imitating, we find—

*Μή τίς τοι τάχα Ἴρου ἀμείνων ἄλλος ἀναστῇ.*—Od. Σ. 333. and the Scholiast explains ἀναστῇ by ἀγωνίσηται. I suggest, therefore, that we retain both θούρον and πᾶσιν, and yet get rid of the anapæst by reading

*Τυφῶνα θούρον, πᾶσιν ὃς ἀνέστη θεοῖς.*

T.

## DE DIFFERENTIA PROSÆ ET POETICÆ ORATIONIS DISPUTATIO.

A GODOF. HERMANNO.

CICIDCCCXCIV.

No. II.—[Continued from No. LXXIII.]

\*PARS I.

*De dictione.*

SED posteaquam de cogitationibus explicavimus, ad sermonem adgrediemur, cujus quas fecimus duas partes, dictionem atque elocutionem, (15) ex iis primo de dictiore exponemus. Ac dictionem eum vocamus vocabulorum usum, quem notitiæ et cogitationes, quæ vocabulis indicantur, exigunt. Hunc pro fine prosæ orationis et poeseos quattuor modis considerare oportebit. Etenim et ipsa vocabula, quæ utriusque generis propria sunt, spectari convenit et



qualitates vocabulorum, id est significationes, et nexum, qui positus est in constructione, et eam denique totius orationis conformationem, quæ animi varias affectiones prodit.

Ac primum quod ad ipsa vocabula attinet, neminem fugit, alia prosæ orationis, alia poeseos propria esse vocabula. Horum ea, quæ ad poesin pertinent, ob hanc ipsam causam, quod in communi sermone non sunt usitata, admonent lectorem vel auditorem, non solum rem de qua sermo est, sed alia etiam, quæ cum ea re conjuncta sint atque cognata, cogitari debere. Est autem duplex horum ratio vocabulorum. Alia enim tota sunt poeticæ orationis: ut *λυκάβας*, quæ, verbo non modo annum spatium, sed quidquid in tali temporis tractu præterea cogitari potest, indicatur, veluti longa duratio, indefessus dierum decursus, mensura immensæ æternitatis. Ad idem genus infinita etiam compositorum multitudo pertinet. Alia formam tantummodo aliam in poesi, quam in prosa oratione, accipiunt, quæ forma nunc aliquid ad vim significationis confert, nunc significationem quidem non mutat, sed tamen, quoniam ad solam poesin adhibetur, animum ad ea, quæ in omni oratione ad pulchritudinis sensum apta sint, jubet advertere. E priori genere formæ sunt antiquiores et rariores, quibus vel vetustas vel insolentia gravitatem aliquam ac dignitatem addit.

*Olli respondet rex Albai longai.*

Et apud Græcos poetas dialecti mutatio, ut *Ἀθάνα* in tragicorum trimetris, atque omnino Doricæ linguæ in tragœdia et comœdia usus. Est enim ipso sono grandior hæc communi. Ad alterum genus pertinent illæ formæ, quæ poeticis flexionibus continentur, ut *δεξιτερός*, *ἐλάσασκε*,<sup>1</sup> quorum infinita multitudo in epico Græcorum sermone invenitur.

(16) Secundo loco de significatione verborum dicendum est. Hujus duæ sunt formæ, una simplex, altera translata, quam vocant tropicam. Utraque et in prosa oratione et in poesi usurpatur, sed simplicem tamen illam, quia ad cognitionem rerum accommodatissima est, præcipue ad prosam orationem pertinere, tropicam autem in poesi quasi domicilium habere suum in promptu est. Ac de illa quidem forma, quam simplicem dicimus, nihil est quod hic disputetur. Quæ ubi in poesi usurpatur, verba non suapte quadam vi, sed ob sententiam quæ in iis inest poetica sunt. Tropos vero diligentius considerare operæ pretium est. Ac tropos ita dicimus, ut quemcumque intelligamus verborum usum, qui a simplici et naturali significatione recedit. Nam qui tropos

---

<sup>1</sup> Hoc verbum ita tantum commemorari potuit, si communis quæ vocatur Græcorum dialectus spectaretur. Neque enim natura sua istæ verborum in *ασκον* et *ισκον* terminationes a prosa oratione abhorrent, sed formæ sunt frequentativæ Ionibus usitatæ.

eo a figuris differre putant, quod tropi singulorum verborum, figuræ conjunctorum sint, non plane verum videntur consequuti. Etenim nullum est verbum, quod utrum tropicam an non tropicam significationem habeat, aliter possis quam comparatione conjunctorum vocabulorum intelligere. Sunt autem troporum genera quattuor.

Primum genus ad numeri significationem spectat, ejusque tres formæ sunt: pluralis numerus singularem significans,

αὐτόξυλόν γ' ἔκπωμα, φλαυρούργον τινὸς

τεχνητὸν ἀνδρός :

singularis pluralem indicans,

*Phrygium ut nemus citato cupide pede tetigit :*

pluralis singularem, simulque singularis pluralem denotans,

καὶ Σκύθης ὄμιλος, οἳ γὰρ

ἔσχατον πόρον ἀμφὶ Μαι-

ῶτιν ἔχουσι λίμναν.

Secundum genus troporum gradus notationem habet. Hujus quoque tres formæ sunt; prima, imminuto significationis pondere majorem gradum indicans, quod est in deminutivis iis, quæ vocantur ὑποκοριστικά; secunda forma minorem gradum aucta significatione notans :

*maximus Atlas :*

(17) Tertia talis est, ut verbum limitatam duabus contrariis significationibus vim accipiat. Quod quidem non potest aliter fieri, nisi sic, ut altera significatio in alterius locum succedat. Ut quod de Vettio monumentum patris exarante dixit Cæsar Augustus, *hoc est vere monumentum patris colere*. Nam *colere* ita dixit, ut, quum arationem vellet intelligi, honorem nominaret, quum autem honorem intelligeret, significaret arationem.

Tertium genus troporum spectat ad nexum, qui est inter res ipsas, in quibus significandis versantur tropi. Atque hujus quoque generis tres formas numeramus. Prima est, qua nota rei pro re ipsa, vel res ipsa pro nota rei ponitur. Ac nota quidem pro re ipsa, ut *sceptrum* pro imperio, *Pelides* pro Achille. Æschylus de Persis et Græcis :

πότερον τόξον ῥῦμα τὸ νικῶν,

ἢ δορυκράνου

λόγῃς ἰσχύς κεκράτηκεν.

Secunda forma est, qua caussa pro effectu nominatur, ut *uva* pro vino, vel effectus pro caussa, ut *palma* pro victoria. Tertia denique forma est, qua totum pro parte, vel pars pro toto ponitur, ut quum populus pro rege ejus, vel dux pro exercitu, equi, ut apud Homerum, pro curru cum equis nominantur.

Quantum denique genus troporum continet translationes a vi, quam res ad animum habent, factas. Atque apertum est, pro-

priam hujus generis esse similitudinem. Similia enim sunt, quæ eandem vim ad animi cogitationem vel sensum habent. Est autem hoc quoque genus trium formarum. Prima ad similitudinem eam spectat, quam cogitatione comprehendimus. Exemplum afferam ex Æschyli Agamemnone v. 1387. ita legendum:¹

πῶς γάρ τις ἐχθροῖς ἐχθρὰ ποσύνων, φίλοις  
δοκοῦσιν εἶναι, πημονῆς ἀρκυστάτων  
φράζει' ἂν ὕψος κρεῖσσον ἐκπηδήματος;

Secunda forma rerum ipsarum nullam habet comparisonem, sed similitudinem indicat affectionum animi, (18) quæ e diversis rebus nasci solent.

Ἀρτέμιδος χιονοτρόφον ὕμμα Κιθαιρών.

Tertia denique forma similitudinem indicat affectionis animi propter opinionem aliquam necessariæ. Ejusmodi sunt illi tropi, qui in blanditiis et conviciis inveniuntur. Qui primus, quem amaret, mel suum vel corculum, quem contemneret vel odisset, stipitem vel belluam vocavit, similitudinem vel ab animi sensu, vel ab rerum istarum natura petiit. Sed posteaquam ista verba usu certam significationem adepta sunt, vis, quæ est in hujusmodi comparatione, non tam ex similitudine, quam ex opinione hominum judicatur, et minus, quid sit simile, quæritur, quam quid existimetur simile esse.

Sed redeundum est ad illud, unde egressa est hæc de tropis disputationis. Tropos poeticæ orationis proprios esse dicebamus. Est enim hæc troporum natura, ut, quum aliud pro alio nominetur, animo quasi campus aliquis aperiatur, in quem aliarum rerum varietate allectus libere possit excurrere. Id ipsum vero poeseos officium esse supra ostendimus, ut cogitatione aliarum rerum, quam quæ argumentum carminis constituunt, mentem oblectet. Quod contra prosa oratio, quæ unice ad cognitionem comparata est, evitare magis tropos, ut qui animum alio avocet, debere videtur. Quare si hæc quoque tropis utitur, alia horum, quam quos poesis habet, ratio sit necesse est. Ac sane, ut prosa oratio a poesi, ita etiam tropi prosæ orationis a poeticis differunt. Prosæ orationis est cognitionem rerum afferre: itaque tropi, quibus utitur, tales sunt, ut res, a qua petita est translatio, ad cognitionem rei, ad quam adhibetur, referri debeat. In poesi vero, quæ animum libero cogitationum lusu oblectare studet, hæc est troporum vis, ut res, quæ tropice per aliam rem significatur, per eam rem, unde ducta est translatio, ad animi sensum variis cogitationibus excitandum adhibeatur. Exemplum hæc declarabimus. Lucere virtutem hominis alcujus et prosæ orationis scriptor et poeta dicere potest, sed uterque suo quodam modo dicit. (19) Nam in prosa oratione tropus unice cognitioni inservit: quare si qua præclara res lucere dicitur, tantum ex hac lucis significatione ad rem istam transfer-

¹ Explicatione, non correctione indigebat vulgata scriptura.

tur, quantum ad ejus cognitionem opus est. Est autem hoc id, in quo cernitur similitudo. Lumen conspicuum est, conspicua est egregia res. Itaque lucere est conspicuum esse. In poesi vero quia tropus ad animi lusum refertur, non solum illud spectatur, quod lux cum illa re commune habet, sed ad ea quoque animum attendimus, quæ propria sunt lucis, fulgorem, magnificentiam, vigorem, jucunditatem, tum etiam ad opposita, tenebras, obscuritatem, languorem. Ut alio utar, palmam aliquis ferre in prosa oratione sic dicitur, ut illud tantum respiciatur, quod is cum eo qui vere palmam fert commune habet. Id est autem vicisse. Sed poeta quum loquitur de iis, quos *palmæ nobilis*

*terrarum dominos evhit ad deos,*

non victoriam, sed vere palmam, non victorem quemcumque, sed palmam donatum dicit: quo fit, ut, quum vellet tamen quemcumque sacrorum ludorum victorem intelligi, animus lectoris latius vagari cogitatione, eaque omnia complecti possit, quæ illa palmæ mentio quasi e longinquo demonstret. Ex his intelligitur, qui fiat, ut idem tropus longe minorem in prosa oratione, quam in poesi, vim habeat. Atque omnino troporum prosæ orationis non alia est virtus, quam ut significationem rei per tropum indicatæ leviter augeant. Quare ii maxime probantur, qui usu ita sunt triti, ut vis eorum neminem latere possit. Minus laudantur novi atque audaciores, quia in his animus magis ad tropum, quam ad id, quod per tropum significatur, attendere solet. Quare id imprimis ante oculos habere in prosa oratione convenit, ut tropi, sicubi iis utimur, cognitionem rei adjuvent. Quod qui negligunt, prosæ orationi poesin admiscunt, ut Longinus in his: *μέτρον δὲ πατὴρ ῥυθμὸς καὶ θεός.*

Progredimur ad tertiam earum rerum, quibus prosa dictio a poetica differt. Est ea in nexu verborum, quem constructionem vocamus, posita. Ac quoniam in aliis linguis alia est constructionis ratio, (20) non potest prosæ et poeticæ constructionis differentia ita explicari, ut singulæ formæ præceptis illustrentur. Sed hoc tamen apertum est, prosæ orationis constructionem copiam vocabulorum, usu, collocatione, membrorum denique comparatione talem esse debere, quæ quam maxime ad claram idonea sit perfectamque rerum intelligentiam. Poetica vero constructio, quæ, ut ipsa poesis, ad animi oblectationem accommodata esse debet, liberior est, luxuriosior, audacior, illamque diligentiam, quam rerum accurata cognitio exigit, etiam vitare et studiosius effugere solet, tum novitate orationis, tum quadam etiam perturbatione. Rem exemplis quibusdam illustrabo. In scoliæ collectionibus leguntur hi versiculi:

*συνετῶν ἔστιν ἀνδρῶν,  
πρὶν γενέσθαι τὰ δυσχερῆ,  
προνοῆσαι ὅπως μὴ γένηται  
ἀνδρείων δὲ, γινόμενα εὖ θέσθαι.*

Pene incredibile est, tam invenustos fuisse tot eruditos viros, ut hæc carminis loco numerarent, in quibus nec verba, nec numeri, neque constructio quidquam habent, quod vel minima cognatione poësin contingat. Constructionem quidem patet plane ad prosæ orationis morem conformatam esse, membris æquabili proportionem, et quidem accuratissime, disjunctis atque inter sese oppositis. Similes versus olim legebantur in Æschyli Septem ad Thebas, v. 886.

οὐκ ἐπὶ φιλίῳ,  
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ φύνῳ διαρίθητε,

omissi nunc nostro movit a Schützio. Cum his comparet aliquis velim hæc Pindari :

ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ  
χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ  
ἅτε διαπρέπει νυ-  
κτὶ μεγάνορος ἔξοχα πλούτου·  
εἰ δ' ἄεθλα γαρεύει  
(21) ἔλδεται, φίλον ἦτορ,  
μηκέθ' ἁλίου σκύπει  
ἄλλο θαλπνότερον ἐν ἡμέρᾳ φαεινὸν ἄστρον ἐρί-  
μας δὲ αἰθέρος  
μηδ' Ὀλυμπίας ἀγῶνι φέρτερον αἰδέασμεν.

Nullum hic membrum alteri simile : omnia nova, non expectata, libero verborum decursu luxuriantia. Talis constructionum varietas quo laxius ab omni regularum necessitate remota est, eo minus e conditione rerum, quæ sermone exponuntur, petita esse, ad eamque referri videbitur. Nam quo quæque adstrictior regulis quibusdam oratio est, vel majore æquabilitate constructionum composita, hoc accuratius, quasi definitione quadam vel partitione facta, conditionem rerum exhaustire velle existimatur. Quare intelligentiæ magis, quam oblectationi inservit, prosamque orationem, non poësin decet. Præterea vero quædam constructiones plane sunt propriæ poëseos, quibus in oratione prosa nullus locus conceditur, ut illa,

ἀλλὰ Δωρίαν ἀπο φόρ-  
μιγγα πασπάλου  
λάμβανε,

omninoque tmesis, quæ vocatur. Et apud Romanos, ut,  
*desine mollium*

*tandem querelaturæ.*

Aliæ contra non inveniuntur, nisi in prosa oratione, veluti talis : *mens æqua in adversis rebus, non secus moderata in secundis.* Nam et æquabilis membrorum comparatio, et ommissio duorum verborum in altero membro, quæ e primo repeti cogitatione debent, eam et diligentiam cujusdam et brevitatis speciem præ se fert, quæ ad rem clare describendam accommodatissima, ad animum autem oblectandum ineptissima est. Horatius scilicet (quis putasset?) ita loquutus fertur :

- (22) *Æquam memento rebus in arduis  
servare mentem, non secus in bonis  
ab insolenti temperatam  
lætitia, moriture Delli.*

Non melior aut magis poësin decens constructio existet, si quis cum Bentleio e duobus codicibus *non secus ac* reposuerit. Quid ergo? Itane scripsisse elegantissimum poetam credemus, an potius videbitur, una non littera, sed lineola deleta, emendationem experiri? Nam quanto ille pulcrius ita scripsisset:

- Æquam memento rebus in arduis  
servare mentem: non secus in bonis  
ab insolenti temperato  
lætitia, moriture Delli.*

Perventum denique est ad ultimam dictionis partem, quæ est totius orationis ad animi sensum conformatio. Ea vero figuris continetur. Sed de his quum mihi aperiendum est, non mediocriter me difficultate rei impeditum sentio. Tantum enim abest, ut hic locus, quantumvis operæ in eo consumpserint veteres magistri, satis pertractatus videatur, ut ne illud quidem, quid omnino sit figura, plane habeamus expositum. Namque, ut aliorum sententias præteream, si Quinctilianum, acutissimum virum, sequuti, figuram diceremus conformationem quamdam orationis esse, remotam a communi et primum se offerente ratione, descriptio quidem hæc figuræ, non etiam definitio foret. Quænam enim existimari communis ratio deberet? aut quænam minus communis? aut quid esset, quo cognosceremus, utrum aliqua ratio primum se offerret, an quærenda esset studiosius? Iisdem fere dubitationibus locum relinquit alia definitio, quam recentioribus quoque magistris placuisse vehementer miror. Hi, nec sine antiquorum auctoritate, figuram esse quamdam orationis vulgaris et simplicis cum virtutis immutationem dicunt. Qui quidem, etsi virtutem illam quodammodo explicant, illud tamen non docent, quæ sit vulgaris illa et simplex oratio, a qua ista virtus absit. (23) Quæ quum ita sint, desertis aliorum sententiis, aliam figurarum definitionem quærendam esse putamus. Atque quum universa figurarum vis et virtus ad animi sensum referatur, quumque non in verborum significatione, sed in quadam conformatione totius orationis insit: figuram censemus eam esse dictionis rationem, quæ præter id, quod verborum significatu comprehensum est, aliquid aliud ipsa conformatione orationis exprimat. Hanc definitionem ita comparatam esse existimamus, ut simul et ea, quæ in aliorum definitionibus vera sunt, contineat, et naturam figurarum finemque plane ac perspicue declaret. Verissimum scilicet est, quod jam veteres observarunt, recedere figuras a communi ratione dicendi: at nimirum hoc non explicarunt, quænam esset illa communis ratio. Est vero, quam illi communem rationem non satis apte vocant, hæc, qua aliquid ita exprimitur, ut id ipsum, neque aliud præterea significetur. Id

autem vel simpliciter fieri potest, vel per tropum. Nam tropus quoque hunc finem habet, ut id, quod verbi significatione continetur, non aliud, in cogitationem veniat. Quare, quum tropos quoque ista ratio complectatur, non satis commode communis dicitur, siquidem tropica dictio non est communi usu comprehensa. Hinc valde laborarunt artis rhetoricæ doctores in constituendo figurarum et troporum discrimine: quoniam, si figuras a communi ratione dicendi recedere contendebant, ea definitio non poterat non etiam ad tropos spectare. Natura vero figurarum quæ sit, et qui finis, planissime nostra definitio designat. Nam si præter illud, quod significatu verborum continetur, aliquid exprimunt figuræ, sponte patet, id non posse in ipsis rebus, de quibus aliquis loquatur, cerni, sed ad animi sensum, quo earum rerum notitias percipiamus, spectare debere.

Sed quoniam semel de figuris exponi cœptum est, age videamus an hic locus aliqua saltem ex parte obscuritate illa, qua hactenus premebatur, liberari possit. Quamquam enim et antiqui et recentiores artis rhetoricæ doctores satis copiose de figuris disseruerunt, non est tamen mirum, si, uatura figurarum non plane perspecta, non sunt certa quadam via et ratione ingressi. (24) Atque illi non solum in enumerandis figuris temere versati sunt, sed multas etiam posuerunt figuras, in quas minime quadrat figurarum appellatio. Planeque, si illorum vestigia sequi vellemus, nulla denique usquam non figurata oratio foret. Sed id quidem recte observarunt, duo esse figurarum genera, unum, quas verborum figuras, alterum, quas sententiarum vocant. Quamquam quid inter utrasque interesset, non plane aperuerunt. Figuræ verborum, nostra quidem sententia, sunt quædam conformationes orationis, quibus ea, quæ materia est enunciationum, certam ad animi sensum vim accipit; figuræ sententiarum, quibus forma enunciationum accommodate ad animi sensum mutatur. Utrumque genus in quosdam locos videtur describi posse, ita ut, quidquid usquam sit figurarum, modo vere figuræ sint, ad aliquem ex his locis referri debeat.

Atque in verborum figuris primo copia spectatur, qua aliquid enunciamus. Ea talis est, ut aut in iisdem vocabulis, quibus aliqua res designatur, sese contineat, aut plura adjungat, aut omnia, ex quibus constat ea res, explicet. Hæ figuræ sunt anadiplosis, pleonasmus, periphrasis. Anadiplosis,

τὸ δ' ἐγὼ ἀντίος εἶμι, καὶ εἰ περὶ χεῖρας ἔοικεν,  
εἰ περὶ χεῖρας ἔοικε, μένος δ' αἰθῶνι σιδήρῳ.

Et quæcumque existant similes formæ, sive statim repetito verbo, sive aliis interjectis. Pleonasmus, ποσὶ βαλίνειν, ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἰδέσθαι. Periphrasis,

πατρὸς ἐμοῦ πατήρ.

Deinde aliæ figuræ ad veritatem rei pertinent. Harum prima, quæ λιτότης vocatur, aliquid negat, sed ita, ut plus etiam affirmet,

veluti quum non contemnendus dicitur, qui faciendus est plurimi. Secunda est ironia, quæ ita affirmat aliquid, id ut potius neget. *P. Clodii mortem æquo animo nemo ferre potest*: et quæ sequuntur. Tertia repugnantibus utitur, quæ quum se invicem tollere videantur, non plane tamen tollunt. Hæc vocatur oxymorum:

(25) ἑχθρῶν ἄδωρα δῶρα.  
ναῖες ἄναες.

Ad eandem formam etiam sarcasmus pertinet, qui conjunctione repugnantium quidem, sed verorum tamen prædicatorum continetur.

Porro nexus quoque verborum suas habet figuras. Copulantur enim verba aut sic, ut singula per se consent, quæ figura dicitur syaathræsmus:

στεναγμός, ἄτη, θάνατος, αἰσχύνη:

Ἔκτορα δ' ἐκ βελέων ὑπαγεν Ζεὺς, ἐκ τε κοίνης,  
ἐκ τ' ἀνδροκτασίης, ἐκ θ' αἵματος, ἐκ τε κυδοιμοῦ;

aut ut aliud ex alio pendeat, quæ epizeuxis est,

*viderat hanc, visamque cupit, potiturque cupita*:

eoque pertinet etiam climax; aut ita denique ut conjunctione simul et distinctione singulorum totum quiddam efficiatur, quæ figura partitio est: *hoc et ratio doctis, et necessitas barbaris, et mos gentilibus, et feris natura ipsa præscripsit*.

Postremo consideranda est ratio, quæ rebus cum animi cogitatione sensuque intercedit. Ea ratio continetur notatione personarum. Nulla enim res est, quin pro diversitate modi, quo cogitatur, primæ, secundæ, tertiæ personæ esse possit. Ac quoniam nihil omnino, nisi personæ notatione præditum, cogitamus, si quæ sunt in hoc genere figuræ, eas permutatione personarum censi necesse est. Aliter enim omnis personarum notatio figura foret. Judicanda verò est harum ratio figurarum ex eo personarum discrimine, quod in quaque oratione fundamenti loco constitutum est. Id hujusmodi est, ut prima sit oratoris persona; secunda ejus, quem alloquitur; tertia rei, de qua loquitur. Itaque tribus modis personæ permutari inter se possunt. Namque aut secunda persona pro prima vel tertia ponitur, quum orator se ipsum vel rem, de qua sermo est, alloquitur, quod genus dicitur apostrophe: aut tertia persona primæ vel secundæ locum tenet, (26) quum orator vel de se vel de eo quicum loquitur, tanquam de re quæ argumentum sit orationis, exponit, quod per risum vel in indignatione fieri solet: aut per primam personam secunda vel tertia indicatur, quum orator aut eum, quicum loquitur, aut rem, de qua explicat, loquentem introducit, quod genus nomen habet prosopopœiæ. Duo hujus præclara exempla in prima Catilinaria sunt cap. VII. et IX.

Sequuntur figuræ sententiarum, quas vocant. Harum naturam supra diximus in eo positam esse, quod formam enunciationum accommodate ad animi sensum mutant. Nam quum nulla cogitari possit enunciatio, quin quasdam habeat formas ex iis, quas logicas



philosophi vocant, figuræ, quæ sunt in hoc genere, istarum permutatione formarum censentur.

Ac primo enunciationes omnes, quod ad materiam earum attinet, vel singulares sunt, vel particulares, vel generales. Harum formæ ita inter se permutantur, ut vel particularis singularem, vel singulis particularem, vel generalis singularem pariter ac particularem designet. Itaque prima in his ea figura est, quæ comparatio vocatur. Hæc enim quum plurium rerum similitudinem et communitatem contineat, uni tamen rei cognoscendæ inservit :

λύκος γὰρ ὥστ' ὠμόφρων.

ἄσαντος ἐκ ματρός ἐστι θυμός.

Secunda forma, quæ singularis est particularem enunciationem notans, exemplum dicitur. Nimirum exemplum, si figura est, angustiore quodam significato accipitur: quippe e multis rebus, quarum conditionem indicare volumus, una tantum nominatim affertur, nulla reliquarum mentione facta :

ἡ γὰρ ξυνεισβάς πλοῖον εὐσεβίης ἀνὴρ

ναύτησι θερμοῖς καὶ πανουργίᾳ τινί,

ἔλῳλεν ἀνδρῶν ξὺν θεοπτύστῳ γένει.

ἡ ξὺν πολίταις ἀνδράσιν, δίκαιος ὢν,

ἐχθροζένοις τε καὶ θεῶν ἡμνήμοσιν,

ταύτου κυρήσας ἐνδίκῳ ἀγρεύματι,

πληγῆς θεοῦ μίστιγι παγκοίνῳ δέμῃ.

(27) Tertia forma est, quæ gnome dicitur. Ea sic usurpatur, ut, quum nominentur generalia, intelligi singularia debeant. Ut apud Æschylum Robori Vulcanum adhortanti, ut vincula Prometheus injiciat, ita respondet Vulcanus :

τὸ συγγενές τοι δεινόν, ἢ θ' ὀμίλια.

Sequuntur figuræ ad qualitatem enunciationum, quam logici vocant, pertinentes. Hæc tales sunt, ut aut non dicendū dicamus aliquid, aut dicendo faciamus, ut ad formam totius orationis aliquid pro non dicto sit, aut ita denique aliquid dicamus, ut, quum id deinde veluti pro indicto habuerimus, aliud ejus loco inferri possit. Prima ex his figura est ea, qua non dicendo aliquid dicimus. Ea est ellipsis :

quos ego.

οὐκ εἰς ὕλεθρον ;

Eodemque pertinet anacoluthon :

μητέρα δ', εἰ οἱ θυμὸς ἐφορμᾶται γαμέεσθαι,

ἢ ψ ἴτω ἐς μέγαρον πατρός μέγα δυναμένοιο.

Secunda figura est, qua dicimus aliquid ita, ut ad formam totius orationis pro indicto sit. Ea vero parenthesis est. Hæc enim si omittitur, nihil deesse videbitur orationi, quia ad constructionem plane non pertinet parenthesis. Tertia denique figura est, qua aliquid pro indicto habendum significamus, addita quasi per parenthesis alia re, quæ priorem istam tollat. *Vivit? immo etiam in*

*senatum venit.* Clariora etiam hujusmodi exempla sunt, ut, *bona, immo optima causa.*

Est porro aliud genus figurarum, quo ratio conjunctionis rerum inter sese per formarum orationis permutationem indicatur. In his prima figura est, quæ rem ex nulla conditione pendentem per conditionem aliquam significat: *si quid est in me ingenii, aut si qua exercitatio dicendi.* Secunda figura est, qua res ex aliqua conditione suspensa sine conditionis significatione enunciat: *negat quis, nego: ait, aio.*

(28) Tertia figura antithesis est, cujus hæc est ratio, ut alio posito aliud opponatur: *ex hac enim parte pudor pugnât, illinc petulantia; hinc pudicitia, illinc stuprum; hinc fides, illinc fraudatio; hinc pietas, illinc scelus; hinc constantia; illinc furor; hinc honestas, illinc turpitudine; hinc continentia, illinc libido: et quæ sequuntur, aliter paullo conformata.*

Postremum genus earum est figurarum, quæ ad modum spectant quo enunciationes ad animi sensum referuntur. In his figuris primum locum tenet interrogatio. Sed non omnis interrogatio figura est, verum ea tantum, qua res, quæ vel est certa, vel sumitur esse, per interrogationem denotatur. Interrogatio enim dubitationis est significatio. *Quis te ex hac tanta frequentia, et tot tuis amicis ac necessariis salutavit?*

*Negat quis? nego: ait? aio.*

Neque enim interrogatio pro conditione ponitur, sed videtur tantum ita poni, quia etiam sic dici potest: *si quis negat, nego.* At proprie per interrogationem non hoc, sed illud indicabatur: *sumo aliquem negare: tum ipse nego.* Secunda figura est exclamatio, qua aliquid, quod incertum est, quia non nisi sensu cujusque æstimari potest, ut certum atque indubitatum enunciamus: *o tempora, o mores.*

*O genus infelix humanum, talia divis  
quum tribuit facta, atque iras adjunxit acerbis;  
quantos tum gemitus ipsi sibi, quantaque nobis  
vulnera, quas lacrimas peperere minoribus nostris.*

Ultima denique figura est ea, qua aliquid ita dicimus, ut id propter ipsam orationis conformationem ab omnibus accipi probarique debeat. Hæc vero figura usu continetur noti vel celebrati dicti, quod ad nostram causam transferimus:

*O Tite, si quid ego adjuro, curamve levasso,  
ecquid erit præmi?*

Ad hoc genus pertinent etiam proverbia, sed ita plerumque, ut simul aliam figuram, quæ guoniam est complectantur.

(29) Quæ hactenus de figuris dicta sunt, nihil esse aliud volui, nisi brevem hujus loci adumbrationem, ex qua perspicui posset, ad quod genus quæque figura, quæ quidem vere figura esset, referri deberet. Facile enim intelligi potest, in tanto, qui ab rhetoricis inventus est, figurarum numero multas esse, quæ ad unum ideam-

que genus pertinent; multas, quæ e diversis generibus compositæ sint; multas denique, quæ ne sint quidem omnino figuræ. Sed aperiendum est nunc de eo, quid sit, quo prosa oratio et poesis in usu figurarum differant. Ac figurarum hæc universe vis est, ut orationem alacriorem reddant. Quare quum fere nulla sit figura, quin pariter in poesi atque in prosa oratione usurpetur, alacritas illa vigorque quem dictioni addunt figuræ, pro diverso poeseos et prosæ orationis fine diversam vim habebit. Nam in prosa oratione id, quod præter verborum significationem figuræ indicant, ad cognitionem, in poesi ad animi oblectationem accommodatum erit. Itaque eadem figura si in poeticis cogitationibus, in poetica dictione est, animi sensum; si in sententia et oratione prosa, cognitionem alacritate dictionis adjuvabit atque augebit. Utar ex-emplo synathræsmi. Illa de Œdipo,

στεναγμός, ἄτη, θάνατος, αἰσχύνη, κακῶν

ὅς' ἐστὶ πάντων ὀνόματ', οὐδέν ἐστ' ἄπύον,

vel quæ ipse dicit,

ὦ γάμοι, γάμοι,

ἐψύσαθ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ φυντεύσαντες πάλιν

ἀνείτε ταῦτ' ὃν σπέρμα, κάπεδεῖξάτε

πατέρας, ἀδελφούς, παῖδας, αἶμ' ἐμφύλιον

νύμφας, γυναῖκας, μητέρας τε, χῶπύσσα

αἰσχιστ' ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἔργα γίγνεται:

hæc igitur figura est oratoria, non poetica, quia unice ad id spectat, ut multarum rerum commemoratione malorum atrocitas magis intelligi comprehendique possit. Id enim agit Œdipus, ut rem explicet atque demonstret. Aliter illud:

ἂμ φόνον, ἂν νέκυας, διὰ τ' ἔντεα καὶ μέλαν αἷμα.

(30) Non est in hoc versu aliquod persuadendi studium expressum, sed animus poetæ, pugnae contemplatione abreptus, cumulat ea, quæ sensum maxime tangant, et ex quibus illa, quæ reticet, con-jectando præcipere mens queat. Clarius etiam diversitas prosæ orationis et poeseos, quæ est in figuris, perspicui ex eo potest, quod figuræ quædam in poesi, a qua persuadendi studium abest, aliam atque in prosa oratione constructionem admittunt. Ut synathræsmus in prosa oratione æquabilitatem structuræ exigit, quo clarius pateat persuadendi cupiditas: cujusmodi est illud modo commemoratum,

στεναγμός, ἄτη, θάνατος, αἰσχύνη.

In poesi vero non solum hæc forma, expers illa quidem persua-  
dendi conatu, usurpatur, ut in hoc,

λάζετο δ' ἔγχος,

βριθύ, μέγα, στιβαρόν,

sed etiam aliæ liberiores et aperte ad animi lusum atque oblecta-  
tionem accommodatæ:

ἑκατογκάρηνον πρὸς βίαν χειφούμενον

Τυφῶνα θοῦρον.

Hæc synathræsmi forma neque cum ea figura, quam partitionem

appellavimus, permutari potest, quia hæc rei descriptionem partibus factis exhaurit, ut in hoc :

εἰ δ' οὖν τις ἀκτὶς ἡλίου νιν ἱστορεῖ

χλωρόν τε καὶ βλέποντα,

quod non est in hoc, ἑκατογκάρηνόν τε καὶ θοῦρον, ita ut, qui sic diceret, inepte diceret ; neque una adjecta copula sic potest con- formari, ἑκατογκάρηνον καὶ θοῦρον, quia hæc forma non modo figura est nulla, sed etiam soli cognitioni inservit, id quod hic abesse debet. Quod si etiam copula iteratur, contrario modo se res habet, quia in ipsa repetitione copulæ alia figura, anadiplosin dico, inest :

αἶ δὲ μετ' αὐτούς,

Κῆρες κνάνεαι, λευκοὺς ἀραβεῦσαι ὀδόντας,

δεινωποί, βλοσυροί τε, δαφεινοί τ', ἀπλητοί τε.

(31) Quare diligenter caverunt Græci poetæ, ne duo epitheta, quæ quidem nihil nisi ornarent orationem, copulæ auxilio conjungerent. Bene enim intelligebant, hanc rationem non poeseos, sed prosæ orationis propriam esse. Quo certius de hac re constet, exempla quædam Æschyli, quæ in contrariam partem afferri possunt, corrupta esse ostendam. Horum duo jam alibi emendavi, unum, quod est in Septem ad Thebas v. 316. in observationibus criticis p. 46., ubi pro verbis languidissimis,

ἀνδρολέτειραν

καὶ τὰν ῥίψοπλον ἄταν,

ita scribendum esse docui,

ἀνδρολέτειραν

ἄταν, ῥίψοπλον ἄταν :

alterum, quod est in extremis Choephoris, alio loco, ubi in his,

παιδύβοροι μὲν πρῶτον ὑπῆρξαν

μόχθοι τάλανές τε Θυέστον,

verba τὸ Θυέστον, ut manifeste ex interpretatione orta, omittenda censi. Sed alios nunc locos addam. Igitur in Prometheus v. 403., ubi recentiores critici ediderunt,

πρόπασα δ' ἤδη στονόεν

λέλακε χώρα,

μεγαλοσχήμονα κάρχαι-

σπρεπῇ στένουσα τὰν σὰν

ξυνομαιμόνων τε τιμὰν,

quis non sentiat quam languide et frigide addita sit copula ? Sed bene est. Nam aliter Æschylum scripsisse non solum lectio librorum μεγαλοσχήμονά τ' ἀρχαιοσπρεπῇ, sed etiam verba, quæ sunt in strophæ, λειβομένα et ἔτεγξα, quorum alterum injuria ejecerunt, alterum mutarunt critici, clare demonstrant. Accedit quod in plurimis libris non στένουσα est, sed στένουσι. Quare, ut brevi comprehendam, tantum abest, ut in strophæ aliquid ejiciendum sit, ut in antistrophæ id, quod verbo illi male ejecto respondit, exciderit. Itaque servata librorum lectione, copula ab epitheto ad verbum

transferetur, hoc modo :

(32) μεγαλοσχήμονά τ' ἀρχαιοπρεπῇ  
\* \* \* στένουσι τὰν σὰν

ξυνομαιμόνων τε τιμάν.

Credibile est nomen populi cujuspiam interiisse: quamquam ne στένουσα quidem damnandum est, si quidem non gentis nomen, sed verbum ad χώρα pertinens excidit. Paullo post similis locus est de Atlante,

ὅς αἰὲν ὑπέροχον σθένος

κραταιὸν οὐράνιον τε πόλον

νώτοις ὑποστηγάζει.

In quibus verbis non inodo hæc, κραταιὸν οὐράνιον τε πόλον, merito displicebunt, sed reliqua etiam omnia quo pacto vel construenda sint, vel intelligi queant, haud facile quisquam explicaverit. Neque enim dubitari potest, quin hæc ita corrupta sint, ut sine librorum novis auxiliis vix queant sanari. Equidem ne in loco sæpius frustra tentato nimium tribuere conjecturis videar, non tam emendare eum, quam emendandi viam ostendere conabor. Atque illud primum facile persuasero iis, qui tragicorum lectione exercitati sunt, verba ὑπέροχον σθένος, quum sequantur hæc οὐράνιον τε πόλον, de Atlantis robore, non de pondere cæli esse intelligenda. Quo magis nomine aliquo, vel etiam verbo, opus est, quod et regat verba ista, et aliquo modo ad ipsum Atlantem spectare indicet. Ejus verbi sedem ut in nomine κραταιὸν quærendam arbitremur, duobus adducimur, iisque non levibus argumentis. Nam et metrum (carmen enim antistrophicum est) vocem illam corruptam esse arguit, et, si aliud vocabulum reponi possit, copulæ usus, qui nunc ineptus est, reprehensione caruerit. Atque hæc ipsa copula suspicionem oblitterati alicujus participii, quam universa hujus loci ratio excitat, magnopere videtur confirmare, siquidem Æschylus, ut ad Vigerum p. 753. docui, copulam inferre post participium consuevit. Certi quidem nihil in tanta loci corruptione afferri potest, sed litterarum vestigia sequentibus videndum erit, ne hic lateat participium verbi καρταίνειν, quod ex Hesychio in lexica receptum, sed nondum in quoquam alio scriptore repertum est. (33) Illud certe crediderim, si omnino istud verbum vitio caret, explicationem κρατεῖν, quam Hesychius et Favorinus adscripserunt, ut a forma verbi alienam, corruptam esse, et in κρατύειν mutari debere. Utcumque est, (dabitur enim hæc venia, ut certe in exemplum emendationis isto participio utamur,) hanc propemodum loci istius formam fuisse probabile est.

Ἀτλανθ', ὅς αἰὲν ὑπέροχον σθένος

καρταίνων, οὐράνιον τε πόλον

νώτοις ὑποστηγάζει.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In hujus loci emendatione verum est ὑποστηγάζει. Cætera hodie aliter constituenda puto.

Alia exempla in Choephoris exstant, quorum unum, quod erat in v. 389. in editione Glasguensi novissima sublatum est. Sed restant tres alii loci. V. 587.

πῆνά τε καὶ πεδοβιά-  
μονα κἀνεμοέντων  
αἰγίδων φράσαι κύτον.

Ubi quis adeo erit invenustus, qui vel verbo monitus copulas istas ferri posse sibi persuadeat? Sed hic quidem locus emendationis nullam habet difficultatem. Scribendum ita:

πᾶνα δὲ καὶ πεδοβιάμον' ἀπ' ἀνεμοέντων  
αἰγίδων φράσαι κύτον.

Hic καὶ non copula est, sed ad verbum pertinet, ἀπ' ἀνεμοέντων autem hoc facilius est correctio, quia in codice Guelferbytano ita scriptum est: πεδοβιάμον' ἀκ' ἀνεμοέντων. Sequitur hic locus v. 722.

νῦν γὰρ ἀκμάζει Πειθῶ δολία  
ξυγκαταβῆναι, χθόνιον δ' Ἑρμῆν  
καὶ τὸν νύχιον τοῖσδ' ἐφοδεῦσαι  
ξίφοδῆλῆτοισιν ἀγῶσιν.

Nihil profecto frigidius potuit neque languidius dici, quam χθόνιον Ἑρμῆν καὶ τὸν νύχιον.<sup>1</sup> At adeo manifesta hic sunt interpretatio-num indicia, ut ne dubitari quidem posse putem, quin ita scripserit Æschylus:

(34) νῦν γὰρ ἀκμάζει Πειθῶ δολίαν  
ξυγκαταβῆναι, νύχιόν θ' Ἑρμῆν  
τούσδ' ἐφοδεῦσαι  
ξίφοδῆλῆτοισιν ἀγῶσιν.

Νύχιος enim idem est, quod magis usitatum χθόνιος, ut ἐννυχίων pro χθονίων, et ἐννυχον ᾄδαν pro χθόνιον dixit Sophocles Œd. Col. 1556. Trach. 501. Porro mesodus est in Choephoris hæc v. 802.

ῥῶδε καλῶς κτάμενον, ὃ  
μέγα ναίων στόμιον εὖ  
δὸς ἀνιδεῖν δόμον ἀνδρός,  
καὶ νιν ἐλευθερίως  
λαμπρῶς τ' ἰδεῖν φίλοις  
ῥμμασιν, δχοφερὰς  
καλύπτρας.

In his non solum insolens verbum ἀνιδεῖν, præsertim sequente statim ἰδεῖν, omninoque nexus verborum, sed etiam illa, ἐλευθερίως λαμπρῶς τε, quæ satis manifestam prosæ orationis speciem habent, lectori creant molestiam. Tè quidem in duabus veterrimis editionibus et codice Guelferbytano abest. Sed amplius progredi debet emendatio. Nam utrumque adverbium, et ἐλευθερίως et λαμπρῶς,

<sup>1</sup> Non minus putidum est, quod apud Euripidem legitur Iph. T. 399. τὸν εὐδρον καὶ δονακόχλος λιπόντις Εὐρώταν. Recte vero duo codd. omittunt καὶ: corruptam autem vocem emendavit Elmsleius.

interpretatio est alius adverbii, ἀνέδην, quod scripturæ depravatione mutatum fuit in ἀνιδεῖν. Argumenta huic conjecturæ satis luculenta tum Suidas et Favorinus, tum Eustathius ad Homerum p. 168, 36. suppeditant. Quanto jam omnia non modo facilius, sed etiam elegantius procedunt :

τὸδε καλῶς κτάμενοι, ὡ μέγα ναίων  
στόμιον, εὖ δὲ ἀνέδην δόμον ἀνδρὸς  
καὶ νιν ἰδεῖν φίλιους  
ὄμμασιν ἐκ δνοφερᾶς καλύπτρας.

## FRAGMENTS OF A SENATUS CONSULTUM IN HONOR OF GERMANICUS.

TACITUS, Ann. II. 83., speaks in the following words of the honors which were decreed by the senate to Germanicus : “ Honores ut quis amore aut ingenio validus, reperti decretique : ut nomen ejus Saliari carmine caneretur : sedes curules sacerdotum Augustalium locis, superque eas quercæ coronæ statuerentur : ludos Circenses eburna effigies præiret : neve quis flamen aut angur in locum Germanici, nisi gentis Juliæ, crearetur. *Arcus additi Romæ, et apud ripam Rheni, et in monte Syrio Amano, cum inscriptione rerum gestarum, ac mortem ob Republicam obuisse. Sepulcrum Antiochiæ ubi crematus,*” &c.

Few people know that the brazen tablets containing the Senatus Consultum, alluded to in the above passage, have been discovered at Rome. Fea, the celebrated archæologist at Rome, has seen the originals ; they were in a mutilated state, and he has taken a copy of them on plaster-stone : and it is fortunate he did so ; for these brazen tablets are no longer to be seen at Rome : some Englishman, it is said, bought them, and took them away ; and probably they lie now, concealed from the world and inaccessible to the antiquarian, in some proud mansion, where not even the owner himself can read them. We should be happy to learn where they are ; hitherto our inquiries have been unsuccessful.

In the mean time we shall communicate to our readers the contents of these fragments, as published by Fea in the *Frammenti di Fasti Consolari e Trionfali*, ad p. xvi. Fea himself has made a sad blunder on the subject of these fragments : he supposed that they alluded to an arch of Augustus, assuming, on the authority of Ligorius an impostor, that the “ Fasti Conso-

## *Fragments of a Senatus Consultum, &c. 203*

lari e Trionfali" had been found on the marble walls of an arch of the Forum; but he is by no means a safe guide on the subject of Roman topography, and especially not with respect to the Curia Julia. If we knew where the original tablets are, we should probably also be able to correct some errors, or to supply some deficiencies of the copy which Fea has taken. One mistake is evident in line 9 of these fragments, where Fea reads OINFS instead of GINES. As the tablets were found in three pieces, he also made three fragments; whereas two fragments belong to the same subject, and must be read together.

### FRAGM. I.

utERQVE DOMESTIC  
 CAESAR · AVG  
 CITRA MARE · SE ·  
 ALIQVAM  
 R · IN PALATIO  
 IN EODEM · LIBRO  
 GermanICVM · ARBITRA  
 SENATVI · PLACERE · VTI  
 imaGINES · PONERENTVR · SVPRa  
 ceterA · QVAE · EX · S · C · HONORANDI  
 QVI · INTER · ALIA · EODEM · VOlumine  
 MARI · PROVINCIARVM · ASIATICarum  
 TIAS · AGERE · ET · ADGNOSere  
 OSARENT · VRI · TERE ·  
 (b)  
 ISCVM · DONARE  
 IPSARVM · QV  
 ARENT

### FRAGM. II.

M. ·  
 · · VM  
 RATIS · T  
 (?) I ASCO · · M1  
 NON · PARCES  
 CAESARIS · PONTificis max.  
 ANTONIAE MATris  
 ALTER · IANVS · FIERET  
 REGIONIBVS · QV  
 CON · VENIENS · RV



TERTIVS · IANVS · VERO	exer
CITVS · DEINDE · PEI	ger
MANIS · ET · PRAEC	tumu
LVM · DRVSI · FACF	re
ET · CVM · ESSET · IN · E	
EX · HOC · S · C · FACTVS	ubi corpus Germanici
CAESARIS · CREMAT	
RASSET TRI	

The word CREMAT in the fragments is also found in the passage of Tacitus, which we have quoted; and it is remarkable, that IANVS and *arcus* of Tacitus appear as synonyms, as they undoubtedly were. Three *Juni* are mentioned in the fragments; and the passage of Tacitus speaks of three arches.

Future editors of Tacitus will, we hope, not neglect these fragments: especially as they have reference to one of the most distinguished men in the history of Rome.

S.

---

## ANTIQUE REPRESENTATIONS OF HELEN.

---

IN the course of some researches concerning Troy, I was led many years ago, by a very natural digression, to examine several anecdotes in the eventful history of Helen. It certainly was not my principal object to ascertain whether she originally issued from an egg; whether Paris was deceived by a phantom or living image (εἰδωλον ἑμπνουν, Euripid. Prol. Helenæ), which Juno substituted for the real person of Helen; whether this princess was seduced by the artifice of Venus, who endowed Paris with the features and form of Menelaus; whether her beauty retained its fascinating power at the siege of Troy, as some relate, when she must have been ninety or a hundred years old, according to strict chronology: 'all these circumstances, and many others equally important which the ancient writers have noticed, I took but little trouble to investigate; being desirous rather to ascertain some points more immediately connected with the Trojan war—thus, whether Helen ever was at Troy? a circumstance which Herodotus doubts, while Homer assures us that she was there; and Virgil declares that she contributed to the destruction of that city by making a signal to the Greeks. Finding, however, that it was not in my power to reconcile

such contradictory statements as presented themselves on almost every transaction of her life, I restricted my inquiries to the representations of Helen left by ancient artists; and a considerable obligation would be conferred on me, if some of the accomplished antiquaries, whose valuable communications so frequently enrich the *Classical Journal*, would point out any figure of Helen, indisputably antique, in addition to those which are below enumerated.

If extreme rudeness both in design and execution be admitted as a proof of antiquity, we must pronounce a gem preserved in the Imperial cabinet at Vienna, to be the oldest sculptured representation of Helen: it is engraved in Eckhel's "*Choix des Pierres gravées*," (XL.) She there appears winged, but stooping in a very ungraceful position; and no admirer of female beauty could possibly suppose this uncouth figure to be a portrait of lovely Helen, did not the name *ΕΛΙΝΑ* indicate the personage designed. Being of celestial origin, she was entitled to wings: and Eckhel remarks that both in Greece and Italy "*elle étoit révérée comme Déesse*." Euripides mentions her apotheosis; and the temples erected to her honor we find noticed by Herodotus, Dio Chrysostom, Pliny, and others.

The name of *HELENA* appears likewise on a gem (a veined agate), which exhibits two female heads contrasted with two ludicrous and ugly male faces or masks. These are engraved in p. 52 of a quarto volume, representing, on eighty-three plates, a multiplicity of antique masks. The copy of this work which I have consulted, is without letter-press or title-page. Under most of the figures, Italian words serve to describe the substance or materials of the original subject: thus, under the gem above mentioned, we find "*In Agata Venata*;" under other figures, *Onice, Corniola, Pasta, Ametisto, Niccolo, Terra Cotta*, &c. Some of the plates appear to have been engraved by *Silv. Pomarede*; but on what authority the name of Helen was assigned to these antique heads, I cannot ascertain.

Winkelmann has noticed three ancient designs, each of which contains a representation of Helen: in one she appears seated; behind her is a female attendant, perhaps *Astyanassa*; Paris takes an arrow from Love, while Helen extends her hand to the bow. (*Monum. Ined. No. 114.*) Another exhibits Venus (the name *ΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΗ* being written over the figure); near her sits Helen (*ΕΛΕΝΗ*), whom the goddess, assisted by Love, persuades to follow Paris: here we also behold *ΠΙΘΩ*, or Persuasion. (*Wink. Mon. Ined. No. 115.*) Another is a picture found

## 206 *Antique Representations of Helen.*

at Rome, and containing five figures: Telemachus, accompanied by Pisistratus in the house of Menelaus: Helen, that she might charm away the melancholy of Telemachus, presents to him a cup of Nepenthe. (Wink. Mon. Ined. No. 160.)

An antique bas-relief on a marble vase shows Venus and Helen sitting on the same throne. Paris is led towards Helen by Love; and the prince seems astonished at her beauty. Three muses are present: Polymnia, leaning on a pillar, and holding in one hand a roll or volume; Euterpe, playing on the double flute; and Erato, with her lyre. (See Tischbein, Peint. Homériques, p. 59.) Another bas-relief exhibits Helen led by some Trojans towards Paris, who is seated near the Phrygian vessel in which he purposes to carry her away. Venus, who has already embarked, holds a lighted torch; and Love, under the form of a boy without wings, assists on this occasion. (Tischbein, Peint. Homériques, No. 4.) An antique cameo of the royal cabinet of France, represents Penthesilea the Amazonian queen, who offers her assistance to Paris and Helen. (See Millin, Galerie Mythologique, tom. ii. p. 90.)

In a bas-relief exhibiting the principal circumstances that occurred during the Trojan war, and thence commonly styled the *Iliac table*, we discover Helen, reclining in a pensive attitude; while various groups of warriors on every side appear engaged in works of slaughter and destruction: near to her is Æthra, the mother of Theseus. To M. Millin's "*Galerie Mythologique*," (tom. ii. p. 79. Plate CL.) I shall refer my reader on the subject of this extraordinary monument.

Another work composed by that ingenious antiquary, his "*Monumens Inédits*," (tom. ii. p. 306. Plate XXXIX.) contains the description of a painting in which Helen is represented. I must here acknowledge that a friend, whose opinion on every subject connected with antiquity is entitled to the highest respect, has expressed to me some doubts concerning the authenticity of the vase, or at least of the drawing from which M. Millin gives his plate, suspecting that it was fabricated for the purpose of imposition. However this may be, as many ingenious antiquaries besides M. Millin have regarded it as genuine, I shall briefly state, that it represents Helen running with her utmost speed towards the image of some divinity from whom she seeks protection; Menelaus, the injured husband, closely pursuing with the design of killing her, is so overpowered by her beauty, that the sword falls from his hand. The celebrated ark or chest in which Cypselus had been hidden by his mother, contained, among other devices with which it was orna-

mented, the figure of Menelaus, who, Troy being now taken, prepares with a sword to sacrifice the faithless Helen to his vengeance. This we learn from Pausanias's description of that extraordinary monument, the *λάρναξ* or ark of Cypselus. *Μενέλαος δὲ θώρακά τε ἐνδεδυκώς, καὶ ἔχων ξίφος ἔπεισιν Ἑλένην ἀποκτείνει δῆλον ὡς ἀλισκομένης Ἰλίου.* (Lib. v. c. 11.)

The figure of a beautiful female, executed in high relief on a bronze of unquestionable antiquity, has for some years been supposed to represent Helen. A young man, clothed in the effeminate Asiatic costume, reclines beside her: two winged Loves, or Cupids, are present; and a dog seems to sleep near the young man's feet. That this admirable antique related to the story of Paris and Helen, was not, I believe, doubted, until Mr. Millingen lately assigned very satisfactory reasons for considering the female to be Venus, and the male figure Anchises. This bronze, which probably served as the cover to his ancient mirror, was found near Paramythia in Epirus, and purchased by Mr. Hawkins at Yanina: its device is explained in Mr. Millingen's very excellent work, entitled "*Ancient Unedited Monuments.*" (See the part illustrating statues, busts, bas-reliefs, &c. p. 21. Plate XII.)

If there exist any antique representation of Helen besides those above mentioned, it has escaped my notice; and the works of modern sculptors and painters are not comprehended in this inquiry. The Scholiast on Euripides suggests an interesting subject to the artist, when he informs us, on the authority of Stesichorus, that those who were about to destroy Helen by overwhelming her with stones, let fall the instruments of destruction as soon as they beheld her lovely face. *Στησίχορος περὶ τῶν τὴν Ἑλένην καταλεύειν μελλόντων φησὶν, ἅμα τῇ τὴν ὄψιν αὐτῆς ἰδεῖν αὐτοὺς, ἀφείναι τοὺς λίθους ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.*

Although we have sufficient reason for believing that long before the Trojan war, (as often since,) woman, as Horace declares, was "*teterrima belli causa*;" yet among the numerous beauties of classical celebrity, Helen has always in the highest degree interested my imagination, and rendered me anxious to discover what ideas of her beauty the ancient artists had entertained. On this subject, any information adding to the little stock of knowledge that I possess, will considerably gratify

*SIMONIDES.*

and the anapæst was invariably restricted to the second place of the first two dipodes. This latter restriction is to be accounted for, as proceeding from a just regard for the preservation of the proper trochaic character of the verse. The tribrach is far more usual and far more elegant as the first foot of a dipode, than as the second; for, as Hermann observes with propriety, "*Insuavis enim est solutio secundæ arseos, in qua requiescere potius, ac debilitari, quam assurgere et augeri vim numeri par est.*" *Elem. Doctr. Metr.* l. ii. c. 7.

In the third and last place, we must notice an observation of the learned Porson, confirmed and illustrated by the researches of succeeding philologists. It is, that a spondee is never the last foot of the third dipode, except when that dipode ends in the middle of a word, or with a monosyllable intimately connected by the sense with the following words. Hermann thus gives us what he conceives to be the principle of the usage; "*Causa hæc est, quod vocabulo ibi in longa syllaba terminato majorem pausam fieri necesse est, quam quæ satis apta videatur, sequente ordine tam brevi quam creticus est:*" a sentence which may seem to imply, that, in the opinion of its writer, a longer pause was made after a spondaic dipode, if so it may be styled, ending with a word, than after one ending in the middle of a word. But on the subject of pause, neither the learned author of *Elementa Doctrinæ Metricæ*, nor the other able critics who have treated of the Athenian Tragic poetry, are sufficiently distinct and precise. The voice being relieved by the longer metrical pause at the end of the second dipode, especially as it is generally lengthened by the concurrence of a sentential, the following dipode should run with a degree of ease and celerity, which is not the case when it is  $\text{—} \cup \text{—}$ , and the greater metrical pause succeeds. Again, the spondee in the last place of a trochaic syzygy, bestows on it a certain weight and importance, a notion included in the observation of Horace respecting the iambic poetry of the Greeks;

*Tardior ut paulo graviorque veniret ad aures,  
Spondeos stabiles in jura paterna recepit.*

*De Arte Poet.* 255, 6.

And as a degree of dignity should attach to the conclusion of every verse of a trochaic system, the usage in question is accordingly doubly injurious to euphony: for to give so great importance to the third dipode, as is connected with the use of the spondee for the sixth foot with the greater metrical pause after it, is to detract from the importance and dignity of the concluding dipode catalectic. This was the sentiment that Hermann designed to convey in the sentence we have above extracted. Our plan of recitation serves also to show us the true reason why the spondee may occupy the sixth place of the verse, provided it terminate in

the middle of a word, or with a monosyllable *closely connected by the sense with the succeeding words*. "Nam ad præcedentia si pertinet vox monosyllaba, non minus, quam in finali syllaba, quæ longa est, asper erit numerus." Hermann. l. c. Rather should it have been said, that when the monosyllable is connected by the sense with the preceding words, the metrical pause sustains no alteration, but that when with the succeeding, the longer metrical pause is exchanged for the shorter. Again we repeat it, that it is one of the most important features of our system of recitation, that it supposes two regular metrical pauses of different lengths, which admit of being lengthened or shortened according to the requisitions of the sense. Thus stated and illustrated, the regulation will be seen to be worthy of the genius of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides; and their universal practice compels us to regard it as a standing law of the trochaic systems of Athenian tragedy. Not a single passage has hitherto been brought forward from all the extant tragedies, in which it is violated: for in the verse of the Helena of Euripides noticed by Porson, elision undoubtedly connects ἀφίστασθ' ἐκποδών, as far as regards recitation. If this be not the natural effect of elision, how can the elision of the final vowel of a word ending in two short vowels, and followed by a word beginning with a vowel or diphthong, prevent the occurrence of hiatus? In making the assertion we have, and advancing the preceding argument, we are aware that we are maintaining an opinion directly opposed to that held by some; it may be many, learned men; nor are we ignorant that Erfurdt, probably with some others, assigns to elision both the power of joining words, and likewise that of disjoining them. He tells us, in his note on Phil. 22. "Duplicem esse apostrophi vim, non eam tantum quæ conjungat, sed etiam quæ disjungat, ut in cæsura pentametri." But, on the one hand, we cannot but yield to the force of the inquiry above, an inquiry which appears to us to be beyond all controversy conclusive; and on the other, we cannot bring ourselves to imagine, that the same individual thing, with no alteration of circumstances, can produce two essentially opposite effects. And not having seen, nor being able to discover any substantial argument to recommend either sentiment, (for the circumstance alluded to, of the dactylic pentameter, is manifestly to be explained on the score of metrical or sentential pause, not on that of elision,) we must, though we highly respect the abilities of those that support them, reject the former as inconsistent with the plain and acknowledged principles of the Greek language, and the latter, as being, to our mind at the least, incomprehensible and absurd.

## CHAPTER III.

## The Iambic verses of the Attic Tragedians.

In entering on the consideration of this species of metre, we can scarcely think it requisite to remind our readers, that it was often used by the tragedians of Athens, in the choruses of their plays; still more unnecessary must it be to add, that the Senarius or Iambic trimeter acatalectic was the principal verse of every dramatic production. Nor will the observations, we conceive, that were introduced in the former chapters, fail of suggesting to the mind, that in the verses used by the chorus, far greater freedom of usage was permitted than was allowable in the Tragic senarius; in fact, that in those, the feet admissible was almost the only particular to which attention was paid. Accordingly, without noticing these points at greater length, points in themselves important, but in which every one must be well versed, we proceed to examine in what manner the Iambic trimeter of Greek Tragedy was recited.

Although our confidence of the correctness and superior excellence of our principles of recitation remained unshaken, from a decided conviction that those principles are in themselves firm and substantial, and a knowledge of their peculiar adaptation to every species of verse to which they had been applied; we were far from being, on that account, devoid of self-diffidence, on approaching a species of verse, that has engaged the utmost extent of the genius and learning of many great critics, whose classical acquisitions we shall ever revere, and whose names we would never mention but with profound respect. It is presumed, however, that the following observations, if they do not justice to the great subject, are no disgrace to the theory they advocate.—Bentley and Hermann contend, and in this particular they are followed by many learned men, that iambic metre originated in trochaic, and that the senarius of the tragedians is to be scanned as a trochaic trimeter catalectic, with an anacrusis or an additional introductory syllable. It is not our province to determine, whether iambic metre *originated* in trochaic, or trochaic in iambic; nor can this we think be determined, both hypotheses appearing to us equally natural and probable. But we most strenuously contend, with other philologists of no inconsiderable learning, that it is in the highest degree improbable, that iambic verse was considered by the ancients as a *species of trochaic*; and the declarations of many ancient prosodians give no little countenance to our opinion. On this head it will be sufficient to quote a passage from Gaisford's edition of Hephæstio, a passage introduced by the accurate and learned Maltby, in his treatise on Prosody:—“Grammatici nonnulli omnia metrorum genera, a dactylico et iambico orta existimant, ut Marius Victorinus, p. 2552. ‘Omnia ex dactylico et iambico principalibus orta noscuntur. Nam quæ-

cunque protuleris, ex his profluere fontibus, et ad hæc referri, velut semina, examinando reperies. Hæc enim sola duo metra, quamvis et iambicum heroi sit traductivum, utpote cum trimeter de hexametro manasse noscatur, hæc sola possunt Prototyporum Prototypa dici, et omnium metrorum elementa. Reliqua autem horum ἀποτήματα.'” And of this we may be sure, that if the Athenians did not consider their iambic verses a species of trochaic, they did not *recite* them as composed of trochees, and thus give them in effect the nature of that kind of metre. But we have here to consider *not* particularly the sentiments of those, who, without attending to what they may conceive to be less prominent distinctions of metre, speak of the *cæsura* as dividing every verse into two, or sometimes more grand parts. Of their doctrine, the following extract from Hermann’s work on Metrical Science will perhaps furnish our readers with a sufficiently accurate idea, as it contains not only his own opinions, but also, when candidly sifted, those of Professor Porson. “Ita enim existimamus hanc versum natura sua plures admittere cæsuras, quarum eas, ex quibus ordines vel nimis æquales, vel inepte inæquales prodituri essent, raro, nec nisi aut certa de causa, aut etiam negligentia quadam usurpatas esse; interdum autem, quod ipsum incuriæ tribuendum videtur omnem neglectam esse cæsuram, quod in tam brevi versu, si raro fiat, non habet magnam offensionem. Ex his æstimari poterit, quid sentiam de iis, quæ Porsonus in supplemento præfationis ad Hecubam, p. 24. seqq. disputavit. Sed ea ne silentio preteream auctoritas viri facit, quæ apud populares ejus tanta est, ut ab ejus placitis discedere pene religioni sibi ducunt. Is cæsurae ejus, quæ *πενθημιερῆς* vocatur, quattuor facit genera, prouti ea vel in brevi, vel in longa syllaba, idque vel sine elisione, vel cum elisione fiat. At hæ distinctiones, mea sententia, plane inutiles sunt, siquidem brevis an longa ista syllaba sit, nihil interest, elisio autem, ut supra adnotavi, cæsuram nihil impedit. Huic cæsurae addit aliam *ἐφθημιερῆ* a grammaticis vocatam, quæ est in medio quarto pede. Ejus octo ponit diversas formas, prouti vel in longiore vocabulo vel in voce monosyllaba fiat, eaque vel enclitica vel non enclitica; hanc autem non encliticam vel talem esse, quæ sententiam inchoare nequeat, vel talem, quæ possit inchoare sententiam; hanc postremam porro vel ad præcedentia pertinere, vel ad sequentia; denique in his omnibus vel abesse elisionem vel adesse. In his quoque primum, elisio facta sit, an non sit facta, nihil ad rem. Quod ad cætera attinet, non est obscurum, permixta esse, quæ diversissima sunt. Nam primo si cæsura illa *ἐφθημιερῆς* per se spectaretur, fatendum est, posteriorem versus partem numero esse valde inepto, minimeque cum prioribus congruente; quod facile sentiet, qui utramque partem in pronunciando satis longa pausa disjungat :

Ἰκκὼ νεκρῶν κενθῶνα | καὶ σκότον πύλας.



Nam posterior pars ' - - - , ita dissimilis est priori, ita levis, ita pene ludicra, ut omnem numerorum gravitatem frangat atque debilitet. Itaque quis non, ubi licitum est, satius putabit, versum hoc potius modo dividere,

Ἦκω νεκρῶν | κευθμῶνα καὶ σκοτον πόλιν,

in qua divisione servatur gravitas numeri et magnificentia? At, inquit, non ubique potest ita. Fateor. Tum vero aut nullam omnino adhibebimus incisionem, aut, si sensus cæsurae ἐφθιμιερῇ commendat, adhibebimus quidem eam sed sequentem versus partem, quo debilitas ista numeri, quam indicavimus, evitetur, ita dividemus, ' - | - - - . Idque fecisse Græcos, infra demonstrabimus. Denique quæ postrema duo exempla posuit, in quibus ipse minus jucundam esse cæsura fatetur, quis est, qui ita, ut ipse jubet, reluctantē verborum sensu, quam sic, ut postulat sensus, dividere malit,

Ἀλλ' ὅν πόλιν στυγεῖ, | σὺ τιμήσεις νεκρόν;

Ὅταν γὰρ εὖ φρονῇς, | τόθ' ἡγήσῃς σὺ νῶν.

Aut quis credat, histrionem aliter quam ut sententiæ consentaneum erat, pronunciasse, quum si numerus non sententia in pronuntiando observari debeat, nihil impediat, quin etiam in mediis vocabulis incidatur? Itaque hoc genus incisionis prorsus idem est cum eo, quod quasi cæsurae nomine insigniri voluit, quia in tertii pedis fine cum elisione vel in ipsa voce, vel in additis γ', δ', μ', σ', τ', incisio fiat. Nam quod dicit, minus jucundam esse cæsura in illis versibus, non potest profecto ad incisionem post σὺ vel τόθ' admissam spectare, quia sic etiam ille versus,

Πολλῶν λόγων εὐρίμαθ', ὥστε μὴ θανεῖν,

injucundam cæsura habiturus esset, sed aperte eo pertinet, quod ante σὺ et τόθ' incisio fit. Id autem quam rationem habeat, apertum est. Nam in duas æquales partes dividitur versus, eaque re omnis tollitur varietas." l. 2. c. 14. To criticise on this criticism, we must in the first place observe, that some, adopting the methods of Porson or of Hermann, may recite one part of the verse as composed of iambs, the other or others as of trochees; whilst, on the contrary, some may uniformly adopt the pronunciation either of the iamb or trochee. The recitation by trochees, either in whole or in part, we cannot but decidedly condemn; it is, in effect, to take from the verse its iambic character, if the expression may be allowed, and to reduce it to a species of trochaic or to a kind of asynartetic. It remains to inquire into the opinions of those, who, adopting the grand divisions of the verse resulting from what is termed the cæsura, retain the pronunciation of the iamb. And to make the matter as clear and comprehensible as may be, we shall exhibit the comparative excellence of recitation by the cæsural scheme, and according to the general principles laid down in the first chapter.

Κινδύνος ἐσχεῖ | δόρῃ πᾶσιν Ἑλληνικῶ.

Κινδύου ἐσχεῖ δόρῃ | πᾶσιν Ἑλληνικῶ.

The occurrence of the tribach  $\cup \cup \cup$  obviates the unpleasantness which would otherwise arise from the less metrical pause in the middle of a verse.

Λιπών, ἰν' Ἀιδῆς | χώρῃς ᾠκίσταί θεῶν.

Λιπών, | ἰν' Ἀιδῆς χώρῃς ᾠκίσταί | θεῶν.

Ἡκὼ νεκρῶν κευθμώνῃ | καὶ σκότου πύλῃς.

Ἡκὼ νεκρῶν | κευθμώνῃ | καὶ σκότου πύλῃς.

Ἡκὼ | νεκρῶν | κευθμώνῃ καὶ | σκότου πύλῃς.

In the former of these verses, let it be observed, the ~~less~~ metrical pause was exchanged for the sentential comma, in recitation, after the first foot; and in the latter, the greater metrical pause was exchanged for the less after καὶ, according to the standing principles of our theory of recitation. Before we come to the inference, we must be allowed to add one more remark respecting the above verses recited by our method; viz. that the less metrical pause designated | is equivalent to that at the end of an important word in prose, and is, on account of its shortness, perceptible only to such hearers as are particularly attentive to the pronunciation, that the greater | is about half as long as the comma, and that the frequent occurrence of these pauses was far from involving *monotony*. Nothing should be more firmly insisted on, than that these metrical pauses are in themselves short, are liable to variation from the sense, and that they must be made in conjunction with the proper observance of quantity, metrical accent, sentential emphasis, and tones: for in no one particular are we more subject to error; and the consequence of error will be, the substitution of pedantry for refinement. Indeed, a faithful and correct pronunciation of the ancient Greek Tragedy, according to our method, is scarcely attainable in the present day; but the Athenian actor knew well how to convey to the ear every nice distinction, and an Athenian audience how to relish them. On this head we refer the reader to the notes of Taylor on the first and sixteenth paragraphs of the Oration of Demosthenes on the Crown (Priestley's edit.); where will be found remarks worthy of the writer. Two sentences from Cicero's Treatise on Oratory, therein quoted, we cannot forbear extracting:—"Atheniensium semper fuit prudens sincerumque judicium, nihil ut possent, nisi incorruptum audire et elegans. Eorum religioni cum serviret orator, nullum verbum insolens, nullum odiosum ponere audebat. Ad Atticorum igitur aures teretes et religiosas qui se accommodabant, ii sunt exstimandi Attice

dicere. At in his si paulum modo offensum est, ut aut contractione brevius fieret, aut productione longius, theatra tota reclamant." Having given this explanation, and produced this authority, we confidently advance to the conclusion; and we think that our plan for the recitation of the senarius has, both because it preserves in every respect the iambic character, and because it communicates to every collection of verses a beautiful and inexhaustible variation of pause, a greater claim on Athenian refinement than the cæsural method. It may be asked, how can this theory be reconciled with the notice taken of the cæsura by the ancient prosodians? We answer, in the first place, that some of our best critics have found it necessary not only to call in question, but even to repudiate altogether the authority of the ancient prosodians in numerous particulars; but we are far from wishing to treat them with contempt. Certain, however, it is, that on many points they have erred from what can be shown to have been the usage of the times. We observe, secondly, that there is a cæsura of the foot, and a cæsura of the verse; the former being when a foot begins with the final syllable of a word, and the latter expression being employed by some to denote the occurrence of a comparatively long pause in any particular part of a verse, as, for instance, that at the end of the second dipode of a trochaic trimeter catalectic. If the distinction be attended to, the remarks of ancient prosodians will not, it is presumed, present any material difficulty as regards the adoption of our method of recitation: and, considering the penthemimeral and hepthemimeral cæsuras as of the former description, we shall find, that whenever the former occurs, the less metrical pause occurs after the first dipode; and that whenever the latter takes place, no pause is to be made after the third foot. Now it must be confessed, that a degree of dignity should generally attach to the concluding part of every verse requiring after it a distinct pause, and that dignity which is connected with length of pause: this is a principle which we shall presently have to notice at greater length. And as the less metrical pause, after the first dipode, serves to ennoble, comparatively, the conclusion of the verse, it follows, that the penthemimeral cæsura should be considered an excellence of the verse in which it occurs, provided that such verses are not of too frequent recurrence. It need not be added, that, except in a few cases, the tragedians of Athens did not admit a pause, in the middle of a senarius; and that this will account for the estimation of the hepthemimeral cæsura. There are, however, cases in which these cæsuras do not take place, and the advantages we have spoken of are nevertheless gained. Having come to a conclusion on the general question, we shall not continue our remarks on the extract from Hermann, further than to notice one point, which may be considered as affecting the general principles of recitation we have

adopted for the basis of our metrical opinions. He says, "Aut quis credat, histrionem aliter quam ut sententiæ consentaneum erat, pronunciassse, quem si numerus, non sententia in pronunciando observari debeat, nihil impediat, quin etiam in mediis vocabulis incidatur?" Both the metre and the sense were unquestionably attended to in the recitation of Greek poetry; and there is a difference, be it remembered, between the incision alluded to here, and the occurrence of a pause, imperceptible to the hearer unless very attentive to the recitation. But we are astonished that Hermann could in this same paragraph furnish us with the following, as correct 'incisions':

Κείνη γὰρ ὤλεσέν νιν, | εἰς Τροίαν τ' ἄγει.  
'Ἐπεὶ πατὴρ οὗτος σός, | ὃν θρηνηεῖς ἀεί.

On the whole, sensible that Porson and Hermann, and other great men by whom their opinions have been adopted, deserve ever to be respected on account of their classical ability and attainments; and that these qualities are forcibly displayed in many of their observations on the Iambic poetry of the ancient Greek Tragedians, we still feel ourselves justified, from the considerations mentioned, in preferring to their method a plan of recitation, agreeable to and connected with the general principles that introduced this work. We are far from charging them with misapprehension and ignorance; and we refer the errors we conceive them to have committed in this particular, to their not fixing some determinate principles, on which to ground their reasonings, and by which to correct and illustrate the various conceptions on the several kinds of poetry that their reading may suggest.

In addition to the iamb, Iambic verse admitted the tribrach, spondee, dactyl, and anapæst. The Senarius allowed the substitution of the tribrach for the iamb in *any* place of the verse, with the exception of the last: the spondee could be employed in the first, third, and fifth places; the dactyl in the first and third; and the anapæst in the first. In consequence of this liberty, the tragedian was enabled to embellish his compositions with a pleasing variety; but he availed himself of the privilege, under restrictions imposed by a regard for the preservation of the Iambic character of each line, and of the whole collection. With respect to the position of the dactyl, we remark, that whenever it was used as the third foot, except in the case of a proper name, the first syllable was the final syllable of a word, after which a vocal pause could with propriety take place in prose. Professor Dunbar, to whom we are indebted for this rule, couches it in the following terms: "Cæsura, quæ penthemimeris est, prima dactyli, in tertio loco, syllaba esse debet: nonnunquam etiam vox, vel monosyllaba, vel ita ex elisione facta eundem pedem inchoat." He proceeds to observe, "Hanc legem de dactylis in tertio loco Tragici, nisi in propriis nominibus, semper sibi servandam censuisse videntur. In propriis nominibus

ex tribus vel plurimis syllabis constantibus, dactylum includi licet." Coll. Græc. Maj. tom. iii. part 2, p. 303. We coincide with the learned Professor in these remarks, excepting that which has reference to elision; elision, we do most strenuously assert, unites two separate words, and consequently it is impossible for a word to be made a mono-syllable, in recitation, by elision. In the seven extant tragedies of Sophocles, the Prometheus Vincetus and Septem contra Thebas of Æschylus, and the Medea and Alcestis of Euripides, tragedies which, it is presumed, afford a tolerably correct criterion of the practice of the tragedians of Athens, there are two lines to support Dunbar's assertion; viz. Soph. Troch. 687, and Œd. Tyr. 353; but these verses are not to be depended on, while *τὸδ'* continues to be acknowledged a Greek word, and *τῆς γῆς* a Greek expression. The 281st verse of the Electra of Sophocles may seem to recommend the opposite sentiment to that we have embraced, though it does not furnish the case mentioned by Dunbar; but we correct,

"Εμμην' ἱερὰ θεοῖσι τοῖς σωτηρίοις.

The less metrical pause is to be made after *τοῖς*. Exclusive of these, there is in the above dramas one passage opposed to the rule; we allude to the 818th verse of the Philoctetes;

Καὶ δὴ μεθίημι. τί δὲ δὴ πλέον φρονεῖς;

The Scholia have *τί δὴ πλέον*: indeed, there can be no doubt but that the verse is corrupt, though it is not an easy task to point out the true reading. We are inclined to substitute *μεθίημι· ἄρα δὴ*, or *ἄρα τι*. For an observance opposed by only four such verses out of about 280, we may claim classical authority; and it is not difficult to discover a sufficient cause to justify us in considering it a standing rule. In dactylic hexameters, the less metrical pause took place after a word, the concluding syllable of which was the initial syllable of a foot, unless inseparably connected in meaning with the one following: and this peculiarity of recitation appears to attach to the dactyl, in every kind of verse of a dignified nature. Indeed, this is implied by the usage itself: for the observance can only be explained, as being of itself a standing rule; and as a standing rule it cannot, according to our own or any other consistent method of recitation, be accounted for on any other principle: happily, however, we are not left solely to this evidence. The fastidiousness, or, more properly, the refined accuracy of Athenian ears, made it incumbent on the tragedian, as we have just stated, to give his iambic trimeters a variety of numbers, without impairing their proper iambic character. Now the pause made at the end of the senarius, communicates to the concluding dipode of the verse an importance not possessed by the second; and the second likewise acquires from this circumstance an importance that does not belong to the first. On account of the pause at the

termination of each verse, the third and fourth dipodes of trochaic tetrameters catalectic were invested with a similar importance. It thus became requisite that the third dipode of the senarius should partake, so to speak of the iambic quality, to a greater extent than either of the preceding, and as far as it could consistently with a just regard for variety; and that the second should approach more nearly to pure Iambic verse than the first. The remark may be applied with the necessary modifications to trochaic systems. In anapæstics, on the contrary, no distinct pause being made at the termination of a verse because of its being the termination of a verse, and the distinction of verses being thus almost entirely removed, the property we allude to was not characteristic of that species of metre. But to enlarge on the remark as applied to the Iambic trimeters of the Attic Tragedians;—it will be seen, that on this principle, and we may add on this principle only, a reason in every respect satisfactory and ~~conclusive~~ can be assigned, why a dactyl is never the fifth foot. The observation of Morell on this subject is sufficient to confirm the assertion we have advanced: “Quod ad dactylum in quinta, nullibi, quod scimus, adhibetur; nimirum aurem confunderet quasi sono hexametri.” But the hexameter is recited by feet, and the senarius by dipodes; and the final foot of the former is a spondee accented on the first syllable, that of the latter an iamb receiving the ictus metricus on the last. The observation admits, indeed, of being traced to a vague idea of the principle for which we contend; but were it not possible to allege some more precise and satisfactory cause for the exclusion of the dactyl from the fifth place, this indisputable observance of the Athenian Tragedians must be confessed altogether inexplicable. In the way above mentioned, must we also account for the very unfrequent occurrence of a tribrach in the fifth place; a fact, for which Morell assigned the same reason as he did for the non-occurrence of the dactyl. This grand principle of the Iambic trimeters of Grecian tragedy, gave rise also to the following important regulation with regard to the dactyl; viz. that this foot must never be employed as the third of the verse, except when it terminated in the middle of a word, or with a word after which the cæsural pause, if it may be so named, could not take place with propriety. In the plays we have just enumerated, there are, if we mistake not, about 255 instances of a dactyl in the third place ending in the middle of a word; eleven passages occur in which the foot ends with a preposition preceding the noun it governs, or the verb from which it is separated by tmesis; one (Phil. 117.) in which it ends with the cardinal numeral *δύο*, intimately connected by the sense with the following part of the verse; one (Æd. Tyr. 10.) in which the word terminating the dactyl is the first of a short phrase; and

about eight in which the dactyl closes with a particle, a personal pronoun, the demonstrative *ὅδε*, or the article; the third inseparably connected in meaning with the succeeding words. In these same plays, we meet with, on the other hand, two verses, in which, if the present readings are correct, the shorter metrical pause must, according to our system of recitation, be made after the dactyl used as the third foot. We mention, first, the 55th verse of the *Antigone* of Sophocles,

Τρίτον δ' ἀδελφῷ δύο μίαν καθ' ἡμέραν·

a verse that at one time, we confess, appeared to us to defy all correction. A careful investigation has since led us to believe that the original reading was,

Τρίτον δὲ δὺ' ἀδελφῷ μίαν καθ' ἡμέραν·

and we hesitate not to propose this emendation, as a full solution of any difficulty that may arise from this passage. The second line is,

Ἀελητήσῃ χρόνον; ἐγὼ δ' ἀπόλλυμαι. *Ajac.* 343.

and is obviously opposed to the regulation we contend for. Unfortunately, however, for those who may entertain different sentiments from our own on this particular, the claims of the present reading to correctness are not of a very forcible nature; and we question whether the subjoined verse may not advance greater pretensions to the pen of Sophocles:

Ἀελητή γε χρόνον; ἐγὼ δ' ἀπόλλυμαι.

An observance favored, if not sanctioned by classic usage, is not to be discarded on slight grounds; but add to the authority of the classical writings, the inferences drawn from well-substantiated principles; and although we cannot by all this arrive at positive certainty, yet we do attain a kind of unquestionable probability, which no man having any title to the name of critic will hesitate to consider decisive. Of this description is the rule we are treating of; a rule plainly intimating that the two short syllables of the dactyl *tertia sede*, were united in recitation to the iamb following. By this means the dactyl did not assume that air of importance it justly challenges in the regular dactylic hexameter, but which is in that part of the senarius altogether inconsistent with the principles above laid down. Now, without some slight pause, though it would not certainly be impossible to articulate the dipode  $\text{—} \cup \cup \cup \text{—}$ , yet the pronunciation would not be suitable to that part of the verse; and thus it is, that this regulation furnishes the strongest presumptive evidence in favor of the view we have taken of the rule of Professor Dunbar. When the dactyl is employed as the first foot of a senarius, the dipode may be  $\text{—} | \cup \cup \cup \text{—}$ ,  $\text{—} \cup \cup | \cup \text{—}$ , or  $\text{—} \cup \cup \cup \text{—}$ , never  $\text{—} | \cup \cup | \cup \text{—}$ , and as in the third formula but seldom. We shall notice the case of a tribrach succeeding a dactyl hereafter. To some it may ap-

pear strange, that the dactyl should occur so frequently in the third place, compared with what it does in the first; but the preceding remarks will easily account for the circumstance. The approved form of a dactylic dipode, it has been shown, was  $\text{—} | \text{—} \text{—} \text{—} \text{—}$ , a form which in the opening of a verse will very seldom present itself. The others were *tolerated*, rather than allowed, for the common benefit of the metre and the sense.

---

## BAYER AND BOHUSZ.

---

BEING engaged some years ago in researches on the classical history, geography, and antiquities of Scythia, I received from an accomplished literary friend, the titles of four or five dissertations composed by the learned Bayer; with a short notice respecting the "*Recherches Historiques sur les Sarmates, les Esclavons, &c.*" of M. Stanislave de Bohusz; and these works (of very rare occurrence in England) he recommended strongly to me as sources which had furnished himself with much valuable information on the same subjects: but various circumstances detaining me at a considerable distance from the capital, (where in our great national library most foreign publications of any merit may be found,) I should not have been able to enjoy the perusal of those works, had not accident lately thrown them in my way. For the benefit, therefore, of others engaged in similar studies, and laboring under the same difficulties as myself, I shall here point out the titles of those four or five essays to which my friend above-mentioned alluded, and of many others with which it appears that he was not acquainted. Concerning Bayer, the author of those essays, it may be here remarked that we must not confound him with an ingenious person of the same name, the Spanish Francis Perez Bayer, whose admirable treatise "*De Numis Hebræo-Samaritanis*," was beautifully printed at Valentia in 1781. The writer of whom we now more particularly speak is Theophilus Sigefrid Bayer, celebrated throughout Europe chiefly for his "*Museum Sinicum*," published in 1730; his "*Historia Osrhoena et Edessena ex numis illustrata*," (Petropoli, 1734,) and his "*Historia Regni Græcorum Bactriani*," &c. (Petrop. 1738.) But those essays, which are the subject of my present communication, must be sought among the "*Acta Petropolitana*"—the voluminous transactions of the Imperial Academy of Sciences of Petersburg. I shall here enumerate them, and copy their titles, as they occur in different *fasciculi* now lying on my table, and which, if bound



together, would form two quarto volumes of above four hundred pages each, besides numerous plates. The first of these dissertations (published in 1726) is entitled, "De origine et priscis sedibus Scytharum," and contains 14 pages. II. "De Scythiæ situ qualis fuit sub ætatem Herodoti." (24 p.) III. "De Muro Caucasæo." (38 p.) IV. "De Cimæriis." (14 p.) V. "Numi decem Erythræorum in Ionia illustrati." (24 p.) VI. "Numus Gyrtones Urbis Thessaliæ illustratus." (10 p.) VII. "Vetus Inscriptio Prussica." (11 p.) VIII. "Nicolai Bernouilli Vita." (7 p.) IX. "Chronologia Scythica Vetus." (55 p.) X. "Memoriæ Scythicarum ad Alexandrum Magnum." (37 p.) XI. "Elementa Litteraturæ Brahmanicæ Tangutanæ Mungalicæ." (16 p.) XII. "Elementa Brahmanicæ, Tangutana Mungalicæ." (13 p.) XIII. "Numi duo Ptolemæi Lagidæ explicati." (13 p.) XIV. "De Venere Cnidia in crypta conchylia horti Imperatorii ad aulam æstivam et in duobus numis Cnidiiis." (16 p.) XV. "De Varagis." (39 p.) XVI. "Conversiones Rerum Scythicarum temporibus Mithridatis Magni et paullo post Mithridatem." (64 p.) XVII. "Numus Ægiensis illustratus." (13 p.) XVIII. "Fasti Achaici illustrati." (74 p.) XIX. "De Litteratura Mungiorica." (14 p.) XX. "De Lexico Sinico çu gvey." (26 p.) XXI. "De Russorum prima expeditione Constantinopolitana." (27 p.) XXII. "Elementa Calmucica." (1 p.) XXIII. "De Venedis et Eridano Fluvio." (16 p.) XXIV. "De Conficiei Libro *Chun cieu*." (64 p.) XXV. "De numo Muşei Imperatorii Anideno." (34 p.) XXVI. "De duobus diadematibus in Musco Imperatorio." (10 p.) XXVII. "Origines Russicæ." (48 p.) XXVIII. "Geographia Russiæ vicinarumque regionum circiter A. C. DCCCCXLVIII; ex Constantino Porphyrogeneta." (56 p.) XXIX. "Geographia Russiæ vicinarumque regionum circiter A. C. DCCCCXLVIII. ex Scriptoribus Septentrionalibus." (49 p.)

Notwithstanding the variety of subjects discussed in these twenty-nine essays, the ingenuity and multifarious erudition of Bayer are sufficiently manifest throughout every page, and yield a copious fund of instruction and entertainment to all who delight in classical and oriental antiquities, and in the study of philology, geography, and chronology: many of the dissertations are illustrated with maps and plans; engraved tables of different Eastern alphabets; representations of extraordinary medals; inscriptions cut on stone, and other monuments of former ages.

I now proceed to notice the "*Recherches Historiques sur l'origine des Sarmates, des Esclavons, et des Slaves; et sur les époques de la conversion de ces peuples au Christianisme*;"—a curious work, published in 1812, at St. Petersburg, in four octavo volumes. The accomplished author, whose name I shall here place at full length before the reader, "M. Stanislave Siestrence-

wiecz de Bohusz," is described in the title-page as "Archevêque Métropolitain de Mohilew sur le Boristhène, Président du Collège Catholique Romain, Commandeur de l'ordre de St. André, &c. &c." The first volume contains the "*Traité des Sarmates*;" and informs us that the Scythians, who predominated in Asia, brought colonies of Medes from their own country, about the year 1455 before Christ, and established on the Tanais or Don a considerable number of them, who were called Sauromatae by the Greeks, and Sarmatae by the Romans. Some were settled in Paphlagonia: their true name was Slaves; and the Greeks entitled them Enotians, which corresponds to the signification of the original name. In this volume we find much interesting research concerning the Amazons; those Sarmatians, called by Herodotus Jazyks, who used the Attic dialect: the Jazyks and other tribes of the Sarmatian race, brought into Europe by Mithridates king of Pontus, and led against the Romans and Scythians in the year 67 before the Christian era: also concerning the Alains, the Besses or Bessians, the Japygians, the Sarmatian Roxolans, the Arcates, Spalles, Vales and Vailachians, Vandals, and other tribes: this first volume concluding with some ingenious remarks on the Sarmatian and Slavonian languages.

In the "*Traité des Esclavons*," which constitutes the second volume, our learned author informs us that about the year 81 before Christ, three Sarmatian tribes were brought into Europe by Mithridates: of these, the Basilians, or royal Sarmatians, and the Corollians, inhabited the Eastern part of Europe. The third or principal tribe was the Sarmatian Jazyks, who established themselves near Bycés, a gulf of the sea of Asof; but after the death of Mithridates (64 years before Christ) extended their settlement towards the west: one party of them, in the time of Ovid, (who died seventeen years before our era,) still occupied the sea-coast and the banks of the Danube. Two centuries after, they made predatory incursions into the Roman provinces; and in the third and fourth centuries of Christ, the Asiatic Sarmatians invaded the European portion of the kingdom of Bosphorus; and we find the descendants of those Slavonian tribes among the Croations, Poduchians, Dalmatians: the Ostrogoths, Victovalians, Heruleans, and the Livians or Livonians, near the Baltic; from whom descend the Prussians. In this second volume we find many curious observations on the Lithuanian language, composed of five different dialects, which our author traces to the Sanscrit.

The third volume of this work comprises the "*Traité des Slaves*," or researches on that race of Medes who were brought into Paphlagonia by the Scythians,\* and denominated by the Greeks Enetians: they are mentioned by Homer, Strabo, and Ptolemy; and it was from Paphlagonia that they were led to assist the Trojans against the Greeks:

Παφλαγόνων δ' ἡγεῖτο Πολαιμένεος λάσιον χεῖρ,  
'Εξ 'Ενετῶν, ὅθεν ἡμιόνων γένος ἀγροτεράων, &c.

Hom. Il. B. 851.

Of these Enetians, Henetians, or Venetians, as they were named at different times, some settled in Thrace, and others passed into Italy under Antenor, about the year 1183 before Christ; occupying without opposition the northern part of Illyria on the Adriatic gulf: they also established themselves southward of the Danube, and in Carniola, Carinthia, and Pannonia; but were subdued in Dacia by the Huns under Attilus. On his death, however (in 454), the Slavians, or Slaves, shook off the yoke imposed on them by that conqueror; and subsequently extended their settlements to the eastern extremity of Europe, called European Sarmatia, and peopled Pomerania or Slavia, between the Oder and the Elbe; and from the Danube they passed to the banks of the Vistula in the year 568. But we must here close this third volume, which is replete with interesting remarks on many ancient tribes and nations, besides those which are the immediate subject of our author—the Huns, the Antes, the Bulgarians, Severians, and others. In the fourth and last volume are comprised, the “Citations et Notes Marginales, avec leur Chronologie, des Recherches Historiques, &c.” or references to all the authorities, exhibiting such a copious list of works in different languages, ancient and modern, as sufficiently proves the diligence of M. de Bohusz, and the extent of his researches. To the first volume is prefixed a small map showing “Les passages et les domiciles des Sarmates, des Esclavons, et des Slaves, et de leur postérité:” comprehending a vast space, from Media and Assyria, to Venice and Petersburg; the Black Sea, part of the Mediterranean, Adriatic, Baltic, &c. In the second volume is a large folding map, entitled “La Tauride d’après les Trois Cartes de S. E. Mr. de Hablitz, Cons. d’Etat actuel,” &c. This map, expressly constructed to illustrate our author’s *Histoire de la Tauride*, marks the ancient cities which exist no longer. The third volume contains a much larger folding map, entitled “La Scythique d’après Hérodote depuis 1800 ans avant notre ère, avec des changemens successifs jusqu’à l’an 1800 de notre ère:” distinguishing by Roman and Italic characters the ancient from the modern names.

In the very commencement of this work, the learned and liberal author acknowledges his obligations to our ingenious countrymen who founded the Asiatic Society at Calcutta. “Nous devons,” says he, vol. i. p. 2; “aux recherches de la Société de Calcutta, la connoissance de cette partie de l’Asie qui a été cultivée la première. MM. Hastings, Cornwallis, et autres gouverneurs-généraux pour la Compagnie des Indes Orientales, ayant accepté le titre de patrons de cette Société, lui procurèrent des ressources savantes et historiques, en lui ouvrant les archives.” &c.

P. Q.

*Some Incidents in the Life of Cyrillus Lucaris, Patriarch of Constantinople.*

---

No. II. [*Concluded from No. LXXII.*]

ABOUT noon of the day appointed, the printing-office of Metaxa was suddenly surrounded by a band of one hundred and fifty Janissaries, whom the Vizier had dispatched thither with the intention of arresting the supposed criminal in the very act of printing blasphemy and treason. Metaxa, fortunately for himself, was absent at the high church of Galata, attending the solemnities of the day. Confusion and terror prevailed every where, without any one being able to divine the reason of this extraordinary visit. The Janissaries, disappointed in their principal object, wreaked their rage on the press and its machinery, part of which they demolished, and carried away the remainder, together with books, paper, money, furniture, &c. to the amount of four thousand dollars, on the pretext that they were the goods of a traitor, and therefore forfeit to the crown; the real object however, according to oriental practice, appears to have been private plunder. The workmen were put in irons. Whilst the tumult was at its height, the secretary of the English ambassador and his retinue, Metaxa among the rest, happened to pass by on his return from Galata. Some of the workmen, in the officiousness of fear, pointed out their master to the captain of the Janissaries: the secretary, however, claiming him as one of his suite, and his English hat and dress favoring the deception, he was allowed to pass unquestioned through the midst of the enraged soldiery, and reached the English residence almost lifeless with terror. The commander of the guards, with his troop, returned to the Vizier's to render his report. He was encountered on the way by one of the dragomans belonging to the French embassy, with information of the artifice which had been practised, and of Metaxa's place of refuge. To this he replied, with more regard to justice and humanity than his informer, that it was beyond the line of his instructions to follow him thither.

It was while Sir Thomas Rowe, in company with the Patriarch and the Venetian envoy, was enjoying the festivities of the day, that the unwelcome tidings were conveyed to him. Indignant as he was at the gross insult offered to his dignity as ambassador, and uneasy on account of the serious charges in which not only the Patriarch and Metaxa, but himself and the

government by which he was deputed, were implicated, he was yet too prudent to betray any visible signs of apprehension, and the cheerfulness of the day continued, to appearance at least, undisturbed. Cyrillus, however, aware of the danger of appearing abroad until the first violence of Turkish suspicion should have subsided, took up his abode at the ambassador's palace for that night.

Next morning the Vizier convened an assembly of Mollahs or Mohammedan doctors, in whose presence the books seized at Metaxa's office, and charged with impiety and sedition, were examined. Two apostate Greeks (esurientes renegadi, as Dr. Smith calls them) officiated as interpreters. The controversial tract of Cyrillus, to which the accusation more especially referred, was produced, and the obnoxious passage (which had been dovetailed down to prevent the possibility of its escaping notice) read, translated, and submitted to the consideration of the assembly. It was a defence of the divinity of our Saviour; in the course of which the author took occasion to notice, not without some warmth of indignation, the obloquy and ridicule with which this particular doctrine, more than any other of the Christian creed, is spoken of by Mohammedans. It has never been a part of Mohammedan policy to forbid the free discussion of the tenets of Islam, either by Christians among themselves, or in controversy with true believers, provided only such discussion be not connected with any attempt at proselyting. Accordingly, after due investigation, the Mollahs gave it as their opinion that the passage in question contained nothing which could justly render the author or printer amenable to the existing laws. The accusation on which Cyrillus's enemies had chiefly rested their hopes being thus disposed of, other charges of a different nature, and still less susceptible of even the appearance of proof, were brought forward; such as the dissemination of seditious tracts among the Greeks, treasonable correspondence with the British court, &c. To answer these, the Patriarch's personal attendance was commanded; and Cyrillus, now relieved in great part from the apprehension of immediate danger, hesitated not to obey the summonings. The imputations, indeed, were so improbable in themselves, and so scantily supported by evidence, that he found little difficulty in satisfying the Vizier of their futility. That minister, who, though a hasty and wrong-headed, appears not to have been an ill-intentioned man, was staggered in his belief by this unexpected result. The impression, however, which had been originally made on his mind by the enormity of the charges and the bold-

ness with which they were advanced, was too strong to be at once effaced even by the convictions of his reason: like Miss Edgeworth's Mayor of Hereford, even after the main cause of his suspicions had been removed, uneasy misgivings still haunted him; vague apprehensions of Frank intrigue, and Cossack invasion, and Christian proselytism floated in his mind: and with the view of obtaining a more complete and satisfactory solution of his doubts, he requested the opinion of the Mufti, as the highest authority among Mohammedans, referring to his determination the primary charge above mentioned, of publishing attacks on the religion of the state. The reply of the Mufti is worth recording: it was as follows—That the utterance of opinions contrary to Mohammedanism was not necessarily to be regarded as blasphemy, or as of the nature of a crime; that since the Sultan had permitted to his Christian subjects, without any qualification, the free profession of their religious belief, they were no more blamable in promulgating that belief through the medium of the press, than through that of the pulpit; finally, that it was not diversity of opinion, but the commission of public scandal, that rendered individuals obnoxious to the penalties of the law. This fundamental ground of accusation being thus removed, all the remaining ones sunk with it of course.

It will not be necessary, although it might be instructive as well as interesting, to pursue the details of this affair, which terminated in the complete vindication of all the parties accused, and in the temporary expulsion of the Jesuits from the empire. The typographical project, however, does not appear to have been ever resumed. The machinery was destroyed, and the funds irrecoverably dispersed: the jealousy of the Turks, moreover, had been effectually roused, and with an ignorant and unreflecting people, as with individuals of the same class, the mere fact of their having once suspected, although without cause, is sufficient, by a kind of blind association, to awaken suspicion again, when the same or similar circumstances occur. Hence, perhaps, the abandonment of this most beneficial undertaking.

It was our intention, when we commenced the present article, to give an analysis of the principal events of Cyrillus's life, and more especially of the circumstances which led to the publication of his confession, and the controversy which ensued. But the great labor of compilation, and the narrowness of our limits, have prevented us from executing this design. To those who may be desirous of further information on the subject, we re-

## 228 *Incidents in the Life of Cyrillus Lucaris.*

commend the compilation of Dr. Smith. The documents which he has collected are well worthy of perusal, as containing an authentic, though not very studied or finished picture of Turkish government, French and English diplomacy, Papal policy, Jesuit proselytism, and the state of the oppressed and degraded church of Greece, both in itself and in its external relations: a picture colored, indeed, by the prejudices of the several writers, yet faithful in the main, and so far instructive. It will suffice to say, that after a long series of struggles with established abuse and error, supported by Turkish venality and foreign intrigue; after having been deposed four times from his patriarchal office, and as often reinstated, Cyrillus was arrested under the stale and false charge of treasonable correspondence, privately strangled, and his body thrown into the sea. His death happened in 1638. Dr. Smith's account of this event reminds us forcibly of the circumstances accompanying the execution of the late venerated Patriarch Gregory, the insults offered to his remains, and his subsequent honorable internment at Odessa, as described by Dr. Henderson.<sup>1</sup>

*Præfectus Urbis, Musa Bassa, Cyrillum, sibi triste illud ac ultimum fatum instare parum cogitantem, missis Janisariis in Patriarchio deprehensum, in Occidentale castrum, quod Bosporo imminet, amandat. Junii 27 die, vesperæ satellites illum in lembum trudentes, dixerunt, se ad portum S. Stephani, qui paulo infra Constantinopolim est in litore Thracico, recta ituros, ut illic navi impositus ad quandam maris Ægæi insulam traducatur. At oram volentes, dum se ad carnificinam destinatum accingunt, ille flexis genibus ad Deum optimum maximum magna tum animi tum vocis contentione preces effudit, jamjam moriturus. Venerandum senem primo omni contumeliarum genere prosequuntur, deinde faciem colaphis cadunt, tandemque gutture chorda eliso suffocant. Corpus, vestibus exutum, in mare projectum, nacti piscatores ad littus exponunt, quod aliquanto post ab amicis terræ mandatur. At hostium ipsius livor et odium non cessant: in mortuum enim inhumanissime saviunt. Male enim offensi, quod tumultum reperisset, Kaimakamum (ita urbis gubernatorem nuncupant) adeunt, ut effosso tumulo corpus in mare projiceretur. Iterum ex aquis receptum corpus, in quapiam ex insulis sinui Nicomediensi objacentibus, clam omni turba tumulabatur. Posteaquam vero Cyrillus Berrhæensis, [the usurper of the Patriarchate,] variis criminibus a Græcis antistitibus apud Imperatorem, e bello Persico reducem, infamatus, sedē, quam impietate summa invaserat, motus, Tunetum, 1641, ubi laqueo vitam finit, relegaretur, Parthenius Patriarcha effossas reliquias cadaveris Constantinopolim offerri curavit: inde post solennes in templo Patriarchali exequias, quibus ille, et e Metropolitidis non pauci, ingensque cæterorum Græcorum, qui viri optimi dirum ac triste fatum, juxta miseratione tacti, veris lacrymis deflebant, multitudo interfuere; decenti funebri pompa, plurimis quoque*

---

<sup>1</sup> *Biblical Researches, &c. in Russia, p. 273, 4*

comitantibus, in templum apud Ortakui, quod ad Bosporum jacet, terræ instratum corpus recondebatur. Ita hostium invidia, odio, et fictis injustissimisque criminationibus oppressus cecidit vir maximus, Cyrillus Lucarius, quem ob inculpatores mores, nullis probris commaculatos, et ob acerbissimas vitæ calamitates, et cruentam mortem, quam obiit religionis *Æ*angelicæ defendendæ causa, quicquid censeat D. Arnaldus, et Sanctum et Martyrem habebo.

Dr. Smith, in his appendix, mentions an Arabic Pentateuch presented by Cyrillus to Archbishop Laud, and afterwards deposited in the Bodleian library, containing the following inscriptions, to which subsequent events attach a melancholy interest.

Κύριλλος οἰκουµενικὸς<sup>1</sup> Πατριάρχης τῶ μακαριωτάτῳ καὶ σοφωτάτῳ Κυρίῳ Γουλιέλμῳ Λάουτ δωρεῖται τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον εἰς τεκμήριον ἀδελφικῆς ἀγάπης. Beneath is the following, which must have been written within a few years, at farthest, of Laud's own death: "Donum Cyrilli Patriarchæ Constantinopolitani, paulo antequam octogenarius Turcarum manibus indigne occubuit."

---

## EXTRACTS FROM NEGLECTED BOOKS.

---

No. III.—[Continued from No. LXVII.]

Opus Merlini Coccaii Poetæ Mantuani Macaronicorum. Venetiæ, 1585, &c.

A GREEK poet, having invented a very sorry kind of metre, thought his invention of sufficient importance to be dedicated to Apollo. Assuredly, there is in man a love of distinction for its own sake, and independent of the why and wherefore. "*Famæ* bonus est odor ex re Qualibet." We must do or be something, which no one has done or been before us: if we cannot be pre-eminent, we must be peculiar; for peculiarity itself, to our self-love, seems a kind of pre-eminence. Some have even founded their pride on extraordinary villany; while others, "too good for great things and too great for good," content themselves with aiming at originality in trifles. "Slaves build their little Babylons in straw." We cannot reform a government—we will not endow a hospital—so we content ourselves with the discovery of a metrical canon, or the in-

---

<sup>1</sup> The epithet οἰκουµενικὸς appears to be merely an obsolete form, like the title of King of France, retained so long by our own monarchs.



vention of an improved cheese-toaster. It is not to be doubted, that the original author of Macaronic verse felicitated himself on the happiness of his conception, and rejoiced in his secret soul at the thought of the wide and lasting fame it was to obtain for him in future ages.

All this, and more, might a supercilious critic say, and show nothing more than his own narrowness of mind. Why should we despise what is good in its kind, because it is not of a high order? or who would wish to abridge the proportion, already too small, of harmless amusement in the world? The class *Fun*, to which Macaronics belong as a genus, is undoubtedly the lowest division of wit; it is, however, the honest growth of human nature, and as such deserves to be cherished.

Of the history of Macaronic poetry it is not our intention to treat. Its most flourishing period appears to have been the sixteenth and the former part of the seventeenth century; since that time it has fallen into decay, with Latin verse in general. In our own country it has been comparatively neglected; a circumstance for which a French writer on the subject accounts in the following very polite manner: "*Ce n'est point un reproche à faire à cette nation, qu'elle ait négligé ou méprisé une sorte de poesie dont on peut dire en général: Turpe est difficile habere nugas, Et stultus labor est ineptiarum.*"

Who was the inventor of Macaronic poetry appears not to be known with certainty; but the first who cultivated it with success was Teofilo Folengio, or, as he styles himself in his poems, Merlinus Cocaius, a monk of Mantua, who flourished in the former part of the sixteenth century. His principal work, *Baldus*, is a kind of mock-heroic romance, written in a medley of Latin and Italian, or rather Mantuan, founded on the adventures of an imaginary grandson of Charlemagne, who, accompanied by a trusty knave, a giant, a centaur, and other equally strange allies, traverses the world in search of glory. There is much of ludicrous invention in the incidents, much vigorous though coarse satire, together with lively painting of manners; and the grotesque combinations, in which the peculiar merit of Macaronic verse consists, are managed with good effect. Voltaire (*Memoirs of Casanova*) pronounced it to be a mere heap of dull absurdities; but Voltaire was too much an exquisite in this as in far higher matters. The work deserves a more extended notice than our limits will allow us to give it. We must content ourselves with an extract or two. A rogue of a monk is represented as cajoling Zambellus (one of the genus *dolt*, common in Italian comic stories) out of a fine cow, on which he and the rest of his fraternity are described as feasting luxuriously. Cingar, Zambellus's friend, who is the Ulysses of the poem, and a very diverting fellow, lays a plot for the recovery of the cow, and obtains admittance to the monastery, where he arrives only in

time to secure his share of poor Chiarina's remains. The banquet is described as follows :

Cingar eos reperit quodam cantone cubantes,  
Circaque rostitam vaccam glutiendo sedebant.  
Forsan erant numero vinti vel trenta capuzzi.  
Alter spallazzum, ferit alter dente groponem,  
Alter vult cossam, vult alter roddere pectus, &c.

————— Cingar tirare coramum  
Incipit, et schincam Zambello tradidit unam.  
Nullus ibi parlat : sentitur fractio tantum,  
Membrorumque sonus, sofatio supra manestram,  
Nam caldionus trippis ibi plenus habetur :  
Chioccant labra simul grassum stillantia broduyn.  
Festinanter edunt, quia sic scriptura comandat.  
Jam caret infelix gambis humerisque Chiarina,  
Jam caput efficitur vas aptum prendere cancos ;  
Interiora patent, grandisque corazza videtur.  
Quanto magis comedunt, tanto magis ipsa recedit  
Ventre fames : pariter decrescit vacca famesque.  
Jamque polita nimis sub desco membra jacebant ;  
Nulla magis restat vaccarum forma Chiarinæ ;  
Ossa videntur ibi tantum : leccare taeros  
Incipiunt ; aliter non vasa lavare solebant.

The above is a fair specimen of his strange dialect, rather than of his better or worse qualities, saving one or two strokes of sarcasm which might do credit to a more cultivated satirist. Occasionally he deviates into serious poetry, and not without effect ; as in the opening of one of the cantos :

Tempus erat quando Sol Tauri cornua scaldat :  
Impregnata novos emittunt arva flores :  
Frondificant boschi, salices viridare comenzant,  
Provocat et somnum cantu rosignolus in umbra :  
Undiculis tremulis fontanæ prata baguascunt :  
Quando simul Baldus, Cingar, bellusque Lonardus  
In quendam roseis completum floribus agrum  
Haud procul a Chioza desmontavere cavallos.  
Hic pinus celsam porgebat in æthera cimam,  
Quæ prohibet ramis penetrare brusamina Phœbi,  
Ac pulchram spissis cum frondibus explicat umbram :  
Sub qua projectis armis cant membra quæti,  
Atque reassumunt in lasso corpore forzam.

Besides the "Baldus," Folengio wrote several other Macaronic poems of less merit, a burlesque romance in Italian, entitled *Orlandino*, &c.

LETTERS  
TO  
MR. ARCHDEACON TRAVIS,  
IN ANSWER TO HIS  
DEFENCE  
OF THE  
THREE HEAVENLY WITNESSES,  
1 JOHN v. 7.  
By R. PORSON.  
LONDON:—1790.

LETTER V.

Of the Mss. supposed to be seen by the Louvain divines, of the Dublin and Berlin copies. An enumeration of all the Greek Mss. that omit the verse.

Sir,

I ASSURE you that I lay a grievous tax on my patience, when I condescend to throw away a few lines on the Greek manuscripts, supposed to belong to the Louvain divines. In your first edition you were pleased, p. 13, to quote their words in this manner: "The reading of this text is supported by very many Latin copies, and also by two Greek copies produced by Erasmus, one in England, the other in Spain. We have, ourselves, seen several others like these. This verse is also found," &c. For this quotation you refer to Simon, *Hist. des Vers.* c. ii. But in your second edition, p. 323, a short sentence is added; "The King's Bible agrees with the Spanish manuscript in this passage, as well as in every other. We have ourselves," &c. Martin had omitted the same sentence, and you implicitly copy him. To say the truth, notwithstanding all my candor, of which I have told you so often, that it is impossible for you either to doubt or forget it, this place made me almost suspect that worthy old gentleman's sincerity. For he argues from the close connexion of the two sentences, that the Louvain divines can only mean manuscripts, by the words "several others." "Ces docteurs parloient des manuscrits—dire donc là-dessus et tout d'une suite, 'nous en avons vu plusieurs autres semblables,' n'est-ce pas dire, qu'ils avoient vu plusieurs autres manuscrits Grecs?" Martin rightly refers to Simon, c. 11. but you, Sir, in evil hour took the Arabic for Roman numerals,

and referred to c. 11. What a quantity of belief some men have ! Can the Roman Catholics show such a faith as Mr. Travis's, who believes the infallibility of every individual, author, translator, transcriber, or printer, that is not tainted with heresy. But let us look at the Latin of the Louvain divines (or rather of Lucas Brugensis). "*Latinorum librorum plurimi suffragantur, quibus consentientes duos Græcos codices, unum Britannicum, alterum Hispanicum, Erasmus profert; Hispanico ut ubique et hic conformis est Regius; multos alios his consonantes vidimus.*" Since editions as well as manuscripts are here called by the general name of codices, (for "*Hispanicus codex,*" which you have transubstantiated into a Spanish manuscript, is the Complutensian edition, and "*Regius*" Montanus's edition, which in this passage exactly agrees with the Complutensian,) none but such quick-sighted critics as you and Martin could have made the next words, "*multos alios,*" signify manuscripts. The proper construction of the sentence is this: Most Latin manuscripts agree in this reading, together with Erasmus's British Greek manuscript, the Complutensian and Montanus's editions, and many others that we have seen. If a shadow of doubt can still remain, it will vanish when we learn that Lucas Brugensis published his annotations in 1580, 4to. separately, and afterwards in folio, subjoined to the edition of 1583. The note on 1 John v. 7. in both these editions, is nearly the same in substance with the note already quoted, but varies considerably in the words. He there expresses himself in so plain a manner, that I should be amazed how Martin, bigot as he was, could resist such evidence when it was laid before him by Emlyn, unless I knew what wonders obstinacy and prejudice can perform: "*Quod pro textus lectione facit, cui Græca Complutensis editio et quæ ex ea sunt, cum aliis quas vidimus non paucis consonant.*" Take another specimen of obstinacy., Martin stoutly denies that the Louvain divines meant to insinuate any doubt concerning Stephens's semicircle by the words, "*inter omnes Stephani codices, ne unus est qui dissideat, nisi quod septem duntaxat  $\pi$ o in cælo confodiunt, si tamen semicirculus lectionis designans terminum suo loco sit collocatus.*" And you, Sir, seem to be of the same opinion with your principal, by breaking off your translation at the word "*confodiunt.*" The Louvain divines, therefore, have affirmed<sup>1</sup> nothing about Greek manuscripts, and there is no need of disproving what was never affirmed.

Make room there for the Irish evidence! His testimony, like your Victor's, p. 53. 112. is positive, clear and pointed. The

---

<sup>1</sup> The Louvain divines affirm, that this verse existed in several ancient Greek manuscripts of their times: and their affirmation has never been disproved. Travis, p. 105. 323.

Alexandrian and Vatican witnesses are grown old, and their memory is so decayed with length of years, that they cannot recollect a syllable of the disputed verse. But this deponent is in the full vigor of his intellect, of sound mind and memory. And this deponent maketh oath, and saith, "that there are three that bear record in heaven," &c. All that is needful, you know, Sir, to give this witness a decent degree of credibility, is to show that he is come to years of discretion; for the malicious pleaders on the other side maintain that he is too young to be admitted to take oath. But you and your brother-counsellor Martin prove the age of your principal evidence by two arguments. The first is, that he carries a certificate of his birth about him. This certificate, on being examined, turns out to be a certificate of the birth of one of his ancestors, who lived fifteen hundred years before him. Or, to drop this inimitable allegory, the manuscript says in a postscript, that the Gospel of Mark was written ten *χρόνοι* after the ascension. That is to say, according to Martin's gloss, this manuscript was written in the eleventh century. I shall never like that ugly word *χρόνοι* again. Why did the transcriber write *χρόνοι* and not *ἔτη*? His view is too plain; to expose a brace of painful divines to the scoffs of heretics and infidels. Emlyn, vol. ii. p. 271, Wetstein, Prol. p. 52, and De Missy, Journ. Brit. ix. p. 61, had ridiculed this gross error of Martin; but, alas! Sir, you had read through none of these when you published your first edition. I should not have mentioned this circumstance a second time, if you had not retracted your mistake in so ungracious a manner, that the recantation serves only to aggravate the offence. For "a reluctant and imperfect retraction is more unseemly than the first error, be it ever so enormous." However, the other reason still subsists in full force to prove the antiquity of the Dublin manuscript. "It has double points," say you, "over the I and Y, and Montfaucon (a proper judge in such a case) informs us that such was the fashion a thousand years ago." But this argument is not quite decisive, unless you can prove these points never to have been in fashion since. Now I have seen many manuscripts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries with plenty of double points over the vowels. I have also seen two imitations of the spurious verse as it is written in this very manuscript; and though they are not so exact as I wish, I see that the Dublin manuscript is certainly not earlier than the fifteenth, and possibly as late as the sixteenth century. I see, too, that this is the Codex Britannicus of Erasmus. But this conclusion is controverted, because the Dublin

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Horsely's Xth letter to Dr. Priestly, Tracts, p. 186. "But you allow it with so ill a grace, with so much reluctance and shuffling about it, as takes off all the credit of a liberal and ingenuous concession." Middleton to Pearce, vol. iii. p. 171. 8vo.

manuscript has *ἄγιον* in the seventh, and *οἱ* before *μαρτυροῦντες* in the eighth verse, both which are omitted in Erasmus's transcript of the Codex Britannicus. Therefore say Martin and you very wittily,

Martin, *Verité*, p. 301.  
(174. Engl.)

Travis, p. 69. 149.

It is impossible that one and the same manuscript should actually have and not have the same words, the same syllables.

It is impossible that the same manuscript should differ from itself; or, in other words, be the same, and yet not the same manuscript.

To this master-piece of reasoning and composition, I answer, 1. That the place where the manuscript has been found, countenances my supposition. What more likely than that a manuscript which was found in England, about the year 1520, should be carried into Ireland, and there remain in quiet till the revival of the controversy concerning this celebrated verse drew it from obscurity? 2. Erasmus was a very rapid writer, and his hand was not over-legible. We know that he was in a great hurry when he composed his apology against Stunica, and therefore might himself omit a word, or his printers might overlook it. 3. Erasmus, when he first added the seventh verse in his third edition, inserted *ἄγιον* in his text, though he left it out of his notes. He had not then seen the Complutensian edition. It is not probable that he added it of his own mere motion from the Vulgate. It is therefore probable that his original extract contained the epithet, but that Erasmus, in copying it hastily, made the omission. 4. The omission of the article *οἱ* is so trifling in itself, so easy for a modern transcriber to make, that to lay any stress on such an argument, proves a deplorable scarcity of better. You, Sir, especially, have the less cause to insist on it, who in quoting the eighth verse from the Complutensian edition, p. 79. ed. 1. pp. 172. 287. ed. 2, omit the article *τὸ* before *αἱμα*. 5. Erasmus has elsewhere committed similar or greater mistakes in copying. He quotes a sentence from Theophylact (Wetstein, Prol. p. 124.) which, by leaving out *πᾶσιν* and writing *τοῦ ἀνοήτου* for *τοῖς ἀνοήτοις τοῦ*, he has turned either into nonsense or impiety. And this error passed through all his five editions. But you may prove by the help of your nostrum, that the manuscript of Theophylact, quoted by Wetstein, is not the manuscript which Erasmus used. 6. A general and remarkable conformity, as I have before observed, is in these cases a stronger argument for the affirmative, than a few disagreements for the negative. The omission of the article six times, and of the whole final clause of the eighth verse, is a sufficient proof that the Dublin Ms. is the Codex Britannicus of Erasmus, a proof not at all weakened by the additional omissions of Erasmus's transcript. But I dare say that you will be better pleased with an

illustration taken (*ex fumo lucem*) from your own appendix, p. 27. 43. which contains, among other curious things, the preface of the Complutensian editors, and their note on the famous verse. In transcribing the preface you have written *et* for *quod*, *quod* for *quam*, *epistolas* for *epistolam*, *cuique*<sup>1</sup> in your first, and *quicquid* in your second edition for *quicquam*, *quod* for *quia*, *aliquo* for *aliquando*, *collocato* in your first and *collocare* in your second edition for *collocata* (i. e. *collocata*); you have also omitted *ex* before *apostolica*. In the note, though not very long, you have omitted *et* after *ibidem*, and *s.* (i. e. *scilicet*) after *terra*. I shall excuse your *lectori* for *lectorem*, and *nobis*—*tam* for *non*—*sed*, because they are amended in the second edition. Might we not argue from these variations, that Mr. Travis did not copy that part of his appendix from the Complutensian edition, or that he used a copy of that edition differing from all the others? But not to trifle any longer, experience teaches us, that such deviations from originals happen every day in copying, and either haste or ignorance will sufficiently account for them. I shall therefore equally divide the reasons between Erasmus and you. Erasmus himself confesses haste; and your humility, Sir, is such, that I know you will plead guilty to the charge of ignorance, to which I shall subjoin a civil question: what business has a man to prate about manuscripts and points of criticism, who cannot construe a Latin sentence, or read a printed book?

Erasmus said, in his answer to Lee, that if he had found a single Greek manuscript containing the three heavenly witnesses, he would have inserted them in his text. You, Sir, p. 8, think this conduct of Erasmus mean. Till the duties of an editor are exactly ascertained and defined, this charge may well be spared. But whether mean or not, the words of Erasmus might seem a kind of advertisement requesting any person who knew of such a manuscript, to give him notice of it. His industrious friends in England immediately began a strict search, and were so fortunate, in the interval between the second and third editions, as to discover a copy after their own heart. How seasonable was this assistance in so critical a juncture! Scarcely was Lord Peter more successful, when, after vainly hunting a long time in his father's will for a precept or permission to wear flame-colored satin, he called to mind a codicil written by a dog-keeper of his grandfather's, that, as good luck would have it, talked a great deal about that same flame-colored safin. I have said, that Erasmus never saw the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Cuique* and *collocato* are altered to *quicquid* and *collocare* in the larger list of errata to the first edition. I love a wary and judicious critic, who exchanges one blunder for another, and calls it correcting. "You are a wise man, Mr. Foresight; if you do wrong, it is with a great deal of consideration and discretion and caution."

Codex Britannicus, but had only an extract from it. It could not be expected that two such sturdy antagonists would let this pass without dispute. First Simon's acknowledgement, as you call it, p. 64. 138, is quoted to prove that Erasmus actually saw the manuscript. You ought to know, Sir, that no man is free from slight errors of this kind, which are never to be taken for deliberate opinions or assertions in which the writer stakes his veracity. Simon indeed says, that Erasmus inserted the disputed verse in his third edition from a manuscript that he had seen in England. But Simon (who is sometimes a little hasty and negligent) had no other means of information than Erasmus's own words. Where then does Erasmus say that he saw the manuscript? In two places, you answer, p. 139. ed. 2. which you thus quote, "In codice, unde contuli in Anglia fuisse scriptum," &c. "Collationis negotium peregeram in Anglia," &c. "These are his words," you say, "when discoursing on this British copy." You will grant, I suppose, that Erasmus collated this manuscript, if he collated it at all, between the years 1519 and 1522, the dates of his second and third editions. But the biographers agree that he was not in England after the year 1518. He could not therefore collate the manuscript in England, and consequently in this passage he cannot mean the manuscript, which on 1 John v. 7. he calls the Codex Britannicus. The same answer will serve for the other sentence. If he performed the business of collation in England, he performed it in or before 1518, before he knew any thing of this manuscript. Thus it appears even from your own account, that your proofs turn against yourself, or at least do you no service. The fact is, that Erasmus carried over his manuscripts from Germany to England, and there prepared part of his edition. He says, therefore, "Collationis negotium peregeram in Anglia et in Brabantia." The three last words you have suppressed, I doubt not, for the sake of brevity. "Collatio" is the general work of collation, not the collation of a single manuscript. Do you think that Erasmus collated his British manuscript partly in England and partly in Brabant? If the reader has not Erasmus's works at hand, let him consult Westein, Prol. p. 125, where both the passages above mentioned are quoted at length, and he will see that they have not the smallest reference to, the Codex Britannicus. But when Erasmus speaks for certain of this manuscript, what are then his words? Surely not weaker than, "Repperi, vidi, inspexi codicem apud Anglos;" or "monstratus est mihi, missus est codex ab Anglis," &c. Nothing less. "Repertus est codex apud Anglos." Could he have used such uncertain, and indefinite language, if he had spoken from ocular inspection? Or would he have been contented with hinting his suspicion that the manuscript was corrected from the Latin version, if he had examined it himself? He would then have been enabled from a comparison of other places,



to decide whether it were so corrected or not. Now, if the Dublin Ms. has the Latin division of chapters, (which is Wetstein's opinion, Prol. p. 52.) Erasmus's suspicion was very just. But you, Sir, in your next edition will clear up this circumstance. For, as I hear that you have lately visited Ireland, I take for granted that you have diligently examined a monument so respectable, that, as Martin positively assures us, "Divine Providence has visibly watched for its preservation."<sup>1</sup> In the mean time, to show that the Codex Britannicus did not borrow 1 John v. 7. from the Latin version, you again produce your favorite proof, the omission of the word *ἄγιος*. But if Erasmus himself omitted *ἄγιος* through oversight, what becomes of this Achillean argument? If it was really absent from the Codex Britannicus, might not an interpolator omit it? You seem to think that nothing less than absolute uniformity will prove one writer to have copied another. If such be your opinion, long may you live to enjoy it, for on the commonly received principles of reasoning, you will be confuted in a moment; but if we grant you only the truth of a few impossibilities, you will undertake, like Behai or Socrates,<sup>2</sup> "to make the worse appear the better reason." Though I should admit, what I now deny, that the Codex Britannicus was different from the Dublin Ms., the omission of *ἄγιος* would not prove your point, unless all the manuscripts of the Vulgate agreed in retaining *sanctus*. But I myself have seen two Latin manuscripts in which that epithet is omitted; and Mr. Travis might have remembered that the same word is omitted in four of his own examples from the Latin writers, p. 28—31. The conclusions which I draw from these facts are, 1. That the Codex Britannicus is the Ms. now called Dublinensis or Montfortius. 2. That it contains the controverted passage translated in a bungling manner from the modern copies of the Vulgate. For the omission of the final clause of the eighth verse is peculiar to them. 3. That it was probably written about the year 1520; and interpolated in this place for the purpose of deceiving Erasmus. This hypothesis will explain how it so suddenly appeared when it was wanted, and how it disappeared as suddenly after having achieved the glorious exploit for which it was destined. It might have been hazardous to expose its tender and infantine form to barbarous critics. They would perhaps have thrown brutal aspersions on its character, from which it might never have recovered. The freshness of the ink and materials might then have led to a detection of the im-

---

<sup>1</sup> "La Providence divine, qui veille visiblement pour maintenir dans l'Eglise la vérité d'un texte si respectable par la doctrine qu'il contient, m'a fait venir entre les mains l'Extrait d'un ancien Manuscrit Grec," &c. Verité, p. 271.

<sup>2</sup> Milton, P. L. ii. 113. Plato, Apol. Socr. p. 19. ed. Serran.

posture ; but time would gradually render such an event less probable in itself, and less hurtful in its consequences.

I shall pass over in silence the shameful attacks on Erasmus, pp. 145—147. 348 ; where, instead of accounting for his conduct from his natural timidity, and the violent clamors of his enemies, you make it spring from sheer Arianism, villany, and hypocrisy. Whoever fairly considers the temper of the times, and the peculiar situation of Erasmus, will find much greater reason to applaud his sincerity than to censure his prudence.

La Croze, a professed Trinitarian, (though, I fear,<sup>1</sup> “ the leaven of Arianism fermented within his mind,”) affirmed that the Berlin manuscript was copied from the Complutensian edition. “ Mais [M. Travis] semble faire peu de cas du jugement de M. La Croze. Cela ne sùt pas mal à quiconque fait grand cas de celui de M. Martin.”<sup>2</sup> In consequence of this persuasion, you retail Martin’s reasons of straw ; the first of which is, that the Elector purchased the manuscript for 200 crowns. This, it must be owned, proves the antiquity of the manuscript not less clearly than the expenses of Cardinal Ximenes prove the learning, diligence, and fidelity of his illustrious congregated divines (pp. 179. 183.) ; not less clearly than the immense price that the Duke of Lauderdale paid for Captain Thornton’s bible,<sup>3</sup> proves the genuineness of that bible. 2. Hendreichius, Saubertus, Tollius, Jablonski, Spanheim, believed it ancient. Did these five men, or any of them, give their opinion after a careful examination ? Did they persist in their opinion after doubts to the prejudice of the manuscript had been hinted ? When a critic detects a forgery that has for some time imposed on the world, his discovery casts no imputation on those learned men who have been hitherto deceived. Besides, if La Croze convinced Spanheim and Hendreichius that the manuscript was a forgery, their conversion is more than equivalent to the hasty opinions of fifty others. 3. La Croze affirmed that he had made the matter plain to Martin himself, whereas Martin denied that La Croze ever had made it plain to him ; and La Croze never replied ; but left that venerable Senior master of the field. I see no great disagreement in these assertions. I take La Croze to mean, that he had given sufficient reasons for his opinion, and that Martin knew of those reasons. I believe, therefore, that La Croze was not mistaken in the nature and force of his proofs, but in the nature and force of his patient, whose case would have baffled the united powers of reason and hellebore. But why did not La Croze reply ? \* If his excuse be unsatisfactory, as given by Wetstein, Prol. p. 59. and by

<sup>1</sup> Compare p. 146 with p. 162.      <sup>2</sup> De Missy, *Journal Brit.* ix. p. 78.

<sup>3</sup> Lewis’s *History of English Translations*, p. 47—49. ed. 8vo.

you, p. 165, take his own words from the *Journal Britannique*, xi. p. 90. "Le bon homme M. Martin n'avoit aucun goût ni aucun mérite critique. Le respect que j'ai cru devoir à son âge et à son caractère m'a empêché de lui répondre. Il auroit mieux fait de se mêler de prêcher." 4. Thus far you have only been skirmishing. Now you prepare for a decisive action. "The Berlin manuscript is not a transcript from the Complutensian edition, because it differs in many places." Martin had occupied the same ground, and to maintain it, had intrenched himself in twenty-three choice examples, twelve of which you borrowed in your first edition, without consulting the Complutensian. In your second edition, either by the suggestion of a friend or your own collation, you detected two mistakes adopted from Martin, and the list of examples dwindles to ten. However, Mr. Travis's arguments are like the Sibyl's books; they contain information of equal truth, and they increase in value by the diminution of quantity. One of the examples is so important that I cannot help quoting it. "In [Matth.] vi. 13. the Complutensian edition has the doxology complete—of which the Berlin manuscript has not a single word." Thus you had faithfully transcribed from Martin in your first edition, p. 76. Now the Complutensian edition (as you have since learned) omits the doxology in the text, and gives the reasons for this omission in the margin. Would not a writer, who had any regard for the public or for his own character, on the discovery of such a mistake, blot out the whole sentence? You, Sir, in your second edition, p. 167, repeat the falsehood with unblushing forehead, set down the same assertion, and qualify it with this elegant note: "This doxology stands in the margin of the Complutensian Testament." The argument then is, by your own confession, either false or trifling, and proves nothing but the ignorance or prevarication of its owner. But some writers seem to be incapable of distinguishing text from margin, originals from translations, or manuscripts from editions. Let the reader attend to the next observation; for the words of the wise, says John Dennis, are precious. "In eight of these examples this manuscript agrees with one or more of the manuscripts of Robert Stephens; in one example with a manuscript of Casaubon; in two with the Codex Montfortius; in one with the manuscripts of Saubertus; in three with the celebrated manuscript of Cambridge; and in the last example with the still more celebrated manuscript of Alexandria." From all which you most logically infer, p. 169, "that it is impossible for the Berlin manuscript to be a transcript from the Complutensian edition." How perverse must those men be, that can withstand such a proof! But to strip the unbelievers of all defence, Mr. Zoellner is at hand in the appendix, p. 56, with six fresh examples. And yet loth as I am to dissent from Mr. Travis, I am here compelled to it by the reasons which La Croze and Mr.

Griesbach (*Symbol. Crit.* p. CLXXXI—CXCVII.) have given for the contrary opinion. I shall only mention seven or eight.

1. The Berlin manuscript has all the marks of novelty, such as fresh chalk, parchment, (ink not pale from its antiquity, but its natural weakness, adds La Croze,) &c. Mr. Zoellner, who, to say the truth, speaks more like an advocate than like a judge,<sup>1</sup> confesses that these appearances are suspicious, and makes a very feeble answer, the amount of which is, that in his opinion a manuscript of Suetonius, written in 1472, looks rather younger than even the Berlin manuscript.

2. The characters resemble no manuscript whatever that has yet been seen, but are very like the types of the Complutensian edition.

3. It is written without accents and spirits. It ought, therefore, to be above a thousand years old. But as I suppose you will scarcely believe it to be quite so old (though I am far from wishing to stir you in your faith), I shall conclude that it is a copy of the Complutensian edition, which is also destitute of accents and spirits.

4. Though La Croze calls it a transcript, even to the faults of the impression, yet critics, as De Missy observes, never expect such a conformity as there is between ten and twice five; because it is next to impossible to transcribe a book so large as the New Testament without making many deviations. But you and Martin take it for a first principle, that no book can be copied from another, unless both agree exactly in every word, syllable, letter, and comma.

5. A general and remarkable likeness is allowed; and that, as I have more than once observed, is in these cases reckoned sufficient. Since La Croze supposes the imposture to be the joint product of fraud and folly, it is no wonder that differences from the original are occasionally found, some the offspring of knavery and some of ignorance.

6. These differences are strewed more plentifully through the Gospel of Matthew than any other part of the book. Who perceives not the drift of this contrivance? That if any morose critic should chance to collate the manuscript with the Complutensian edition, he might be deceived by the apparent variation before he had examined too far. "*Nempe callide sibi prospexit impostor, ut in quovis N. T. libro—in promptu esset locus unus et item alter a Complutensi editione manifeste discrepans, quo commodum uti posset adversus eos, quibus fraus suboleret. Atque ob eandem hanc causam procul dubio plures Matthæo adpersæ sunt lectiones,*" &c.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Dixerit forsán codicis Raviani fautor—Nec tamén hic elabendi tíma codicis Raviani defensoribus deest,* p. 54. 59.

<sup>2</sup> Griesbach, *Symb. Crit.* p. cxv.

7. The disputed verse in this manuscript exactly represents the reading of the Complutensian edition ; and,

8. Lastly, every one of the sixteen different readings produced by you and Mr. Zoellner may be found in the margin of R. Stephens's edition. In short, every circumstance favors La Croze's determination, that the Berlin manuscript was copied by an ignorant transcriber from the Complutensian edition, with corrections here and there interspersed by his knavish employer from Stephens's margin. If instead of the eloquent paragraph which I have quoted above, you had been content with this short and simple expression, "In every one of these examples, the Berlin manuscript agrees with Stephens's margin," your argument would have recoiled on yourself, the forgery would have stared us in the face, and the indignant reader would have exclaimed with Mr. Griesbach, "*Itaque jam tenetur falsarius, manifesto fuit prehensus !*"

The calculation at which I hinted in my second letter, (Cl. Journ. No. LXXII. p. 244.) is, if that be possible, falser and fuller of mistake than the rest of the work. You assert, p. 282, that Wetstein's No. 49 contains only the Gospel of Mark, when Wetstein himself tells us, that it has also scholia on the catholic epistles. Perhaps you think that the reading of the text can never be ascertained from scholia. If such be your notions, why do you not explain them ? You would then believe an absurdity ; now you assert a falsehood : "No. 56 is no more than a collection of some various readings noted in the margin of a printed book." Is it therefore to be set aside ? On the contrary, it is at least a good single authority. A learned man had collated the catholic epistles with four manuscripts in the Medicæan library, and had marked the various readings in a copy of Raphelengius's edition. Since therefore that edition contains the disputed verse, if the collator had been silent, it would not indeed have been certain that any of his manuscripts agreed with the printed text ; (though Martin and you would have improved this silence into a demonstration ;) but since Wetstein sets down No. 56, as agreeing with the other manuscripts, he could not act thus but on the actual information of the margin.

In the following sentence, Sir, I must desire you to choose between deliberate falsehood and strange misapprehension. "Of these sixty-five Greek manuscripts, Wetstein admits that those marked 34, 44, 48, 51, 57, and 58, do exhibit this disputed passage. Six assertions, and five of them false ! Wetstein only admits, that No. 34 (the Dublin Ms.) exhibits the disputed passage." No. 44 signifies Valla's manuscripts ; and Wetstein is so far from admitting what you affirm, that he endeavors to prove (as I have done more at large) exactly the reverse. Numbers 48, 51, and 57, he sets down in the list of manuscripts that omit the three heavenly witnesses ; and you rightly observe (from Mr.

Griesbach) in the fifth line preceding this sentence, that No. 58 is a duplicate of No. 22. If then Wetstein admitted that No. 58 retained the three heavenly witnesses, he would admit that No. 22 retained them. But he has set down No. 22 in the omitting list. Either, therefore, you possess a copy of Wetstein's edition different from all other copies, and in it these important confessions exist; or, in five of your six assertions, "truth and you will be found in two stories; and which are we to believe?" I own that politeness alone would induce me to prefer the lady, even without the magnificent character that you give her, p. 127. 374. "that she is all fair and artless, uniform and consistent, simple and sincere." Who shall hereafter doubt of Mr. Travis's "Christian charity," when we find him thus honestly doing justice to his inveterate enemy? You charge Mr. Gibbon, p. 126. 371. in express terms with forging the authority of Gennadius. If Mr. Gibbon be guilty of one forgery, Mr. Travis is guilty of five; if a defender of Mr. Travis should argue, that it is incredible that Mr. Travis should wilfully attribute to an author opinions, which that author not only never maintained, but which he directly opposed; in the same manner, with equal right, may a defender of Mr. Gibbon argue. "But Mr. Gibbon has wilfully misrepresented Gennadius, because his reference is exact." Truly I am so dull as not to perceive the connexion between the two propositions. Would not the suspicion be more reasonable, if the reference were general and inaccurate? You, Sir, p. 71. 157. make Montfaucon say what Montfaucon never meant; and in the second edition the reference is exact. From your own principles, therefore, I might conclude, that you have "wilfully (for the reference is too exact to allow you shelter under any supposed inadvertence) misrepresented" Montfaucon. But I shall show you more indulgence. I believe that you caught a detached sentence without consulting the sequel. Only remember, that a man who quotes in this negligent manner should be the last to accuse others of forgery.

You end your calculation by telling us, that thirty-one manuscripts have the verse to fifty that omit it. What, only fifty? Making all possible deductions from Wetstein's list, I cannot allow fewer than eighty-six that omit the verse. But perhaps you have a new system of arithmetic as well as a new system of criticism. Why did you not rather take Mr. Griesbach's computation? Because it increases the number of heretical manuscripts, and "that way madness lies!" I must try, therefore, myself to substitute a more exact account of all the Greek manuscripts that have been collated on this chapter. I deduct No. 64, one lectionary, and two of Stephens's manuscripts that have disappeared. There will then remain ninety-seven in Mr. Griesbach's list; for I myself have examined No. 63, and testify that it omits the passage. To which add, two of the oldest manuscripts in the Escorial, in-

spected by Edward Clarke, a manuscript once belonging to Bentley, (which I have seen in Trinity College library, Cambridge,) another in Casley's Catalogue, p. 3, another in the library at Vienna, lately collated by Professor F. C. Alter, and ten at Moscow (one written in capitals) examined by Mr. Matthæi; the whole number of manuscripts now extant, omitting this "marvellous text," amounts to one hundred and twelve. I shall therefore not hesitate to conclude with Chandler (Pref. to Cassiodorus), Bengelius, Wetstein, Mr. Giesbach, and many others, that this celebrated verse exists in no genuine Greek manuscript whatsoever; and partly with Mr. Gibbon, that it owes its place in our editions to the prudence of Erasmus; the honest bigotry of the Complutensian editors; the typographical error of Robert Stephens; and the strange misapprehension of Theodore Beza.

#### POSTSCRIPT.

1. I have still a scruple remaining with respect to an incidental question. Simon quotes the note of Lucas Brugensis, which Mr. Travis has so grossly mistaken, as from the edition of 1571. Martin says, that it is in the preface. I have seen several copies of the Antwerp edition of 1574. All these were in octavo; none of them have notes, nor mention this text in the preface. Lucas Brugensis too speaks in such terms (Pref. to his notes dated 1579), as strongly imply that they were then published for the first time. Are there then different copies of the same notes, and did Simon use a copy containing such a note on 1 John v. 7, as he has represented? If that be the case, Lucas Brugensis seems to have been apprehensive that he had not expressed himself with sufficient clearness, and in consequence of that apprehension to have stopped the press, that he might alter his note so as to leave no ambiguity. But I shall be thankful to any learned reader who can explain this difficulty, and either confirm or destroy my conjecture.

2. That I may show my impartiality by correcting errors on either side, I shall observe that De Missy has fallen into a mistake by too much refinement. The word *μαρτυροῦντες* in the Dublin Ms. has its last syllable written in a contraction, and marked with double points, a circumstance not uncommon in modern Greek manuscripts. But on this innocent circumstance he founded a false accusation against the manuscript, that it meant to proscribe the whole sentence from *ἐν τῷ ὀβριῶ* to *μαρτυροῦντι* (inclusive), as doubtful or spurious. I have expended so many lines on the identity of the Dublin manuscript, and of the Codex Bri-

tannicus, merely in obedience to the canon, that enjoins us not to enlarge the number of manuscripts without necessity. Else I would as readily admit as deny their diversity. For since they both are manifestly translated from the recent and corrupt Latin copies, the authority of a hundred such manuscripts is equal to the authority of one, and the authority of one is equal to nothing.

3. When I say, in the foregoing letter, that Mr. Travis prefers Wetstein's computation to Mr. Griesbach's, the expression is inaccurate. He misrepresents them both. He makes a show of mentioning Mr. Griesbach's additions in these words, "to which Griesbach adds four others." Now, besides the manuscripts which Wetstein constantly uses, he appeals, on 1 John v. 7, to those which were collated by Simon, Burnet, Lami, Blanchini, &c. These make up thirty-one; to which Mr. Griesbach adds eight. These manuscripts, together with the fifty that Mr. Travis graciously allows us, would make eighty-nine. But Mr. Travis, either from hurry or from forgetfulness, or from whatever cause, has totally neglected these additional witnesses. Whatever was the cause, it certainly was no dishonest motive. For "to state authorities, and to urge arguments on *one side* of a question alone, is barely tolerable in an hired advocate," p. 125. 370.

Take notice, lords, he has a loyal breast,  
For you have seen him open it.

## NUGÆ.

No. XXI.—[Continued from No. LXXIII.]

Supplement to the Notes on the Latin Poets.

### III. VIRGIL.

XVIII. Ecl. iv. 17. *Pacatumque reget patriis virtutibus orbem.*

The jarring nations he in peace shall bind,  
And with paternal virtues rule mankind.

*Pope's Messiah.*

And thus the line appears to have been universally understood by the commentators. "*Pacatum orbem reget* : etiam hoc ex aurea ætate, quod in ea pacata omnia sunt : obscurius est, quod addidit, *patriis virtutibus*, omnino, majorum." Heyne in loc. We question greatly, however, whether such an interpretation can be reconciled to sound Latinity. We believe that whenever *regere*, in Virgil at least, is followed by an ablative



noun qualifying its meaning, such noun will be found to indicate, not the character of the person governing, but the species or method of government; as *regere arte, imperio, frænis*, &c. We are not sure that Virgil would have written *reget virtute*; we are confident that he would not have written *regit virtutibus*. The true order of the words is, *reget orbem, pacatum patriis virtutibus*; "he shall extend his sway over a world already reduced to tranquillity by the valor of his ancestors;" or, still more exactly, by his valiant ancestors: for *virtutibus* is not used here to express a variety of virtues, each appropriate to some individual ancestor, but the single attribute of valor diffused among a number; *patriis virtutibus* being nothing else than *patribus virtute præditis*, answering to the ἐν δὲ δυνάμει in *Æn.* i. 565. Quis genus Æneadum, quis Trojæ nesciat urbem, Virtutesque virosque —? "the valiant men," the heroes of the Trojan story. (We may take this opportunity of obviating Heyne's objection to the reading *expectata* in *Æn.* vi. 687. Venisti tandem, tuæque spectata parenti Vicit iter durum pietas? "*Ipsc quidem Æneas erat expectatus; verum paullo diutius pietas ejus expectata venisse diceretur.*" *Tua pietas is tu pius*. The line quoted by Heyne after Servius in support of *spectata*, viii. 151, *et rebus spectata juvenus*, is not parallel.) The construction, too, of the sentence is rendered more Virgilian by the proposed interpretation; at least if a somewhat intimate acquaintance with Virgil, as well as with his more especial followers, may warrant us thus to give our opinion. This kind of implicated arrangement is indeed so frequent in Latin poetry, as to be a characteristic feature of it. The line itself, in its measured pomp, harmonizes well with the rest of the poem. The fourth Eclogue, or at least the more properly prophetic parts of it, contain an unusual number of golden verses,<sup>1</sup> so called, and others of a nearly similar construction, in which the leading words of the clause are distributed between the former and the latter part of the line, so as to produce an appearance of equilibrium. Compare vv. 4, 5. 14. 20. 28, 29. 47. This mode of versification was most probably adopted for the purpose of stately effect. Dryden, in his translation of this eclogue, (a noble performance, with all its incorrectness,) has aimed at producing the same result by a more than usual intermixture of twelve and fourteen-syllable Alexandrines. Pope, however, in his *Messiah*, has approached nearer to the style and rhythm of the Pollio.

<sup>1</sup> See *Classical Journal*, vol. xxvii. p. 285.

XIX. Ecl. x. 69. *Omnia vincit Amor; et nos cedamus Amori.* "Nexus sententiæ est paullo durior. Nihil est, quod ab amoris curis solvat animum, vincit ille omnia remedia; ergo mihi succumbendum est." Heyne. This would be rather, *nos et cedamus Amori.* Perhaps *et* is here emphatic: ἐνδοτέον καὶ ἡμῖν. "Love conquers all; why then should I alone attempt resistance?" *Omnia*, all beings; as Ov. Met. Cereris sumus omnia munus, &c. We suggest this interpretation with diffidence, as the context appears to favor the common rendering:

Nou illum nostri possunt mutare labores;  
Nec, si frigoribus mediis Hebrumquæ bibamus,  
Sithoniasque nives hyemis subeamus aquosæ;  
Nec si, cum moriens alta liber aret in ulmo  
Æthiopum versemus oves sub sidere Cancrî.

*Omnia vincit Amor; et nos cedamus Amori.*

Compare, too, Georg. i. 145. *Labor omnia vicit Improbis* —.

XX. Georg. iv. 415. Hæc ait, et liquidum ambrosiæ diffundit odorem, Quo totum nati corpus perduxit: at illi Dulcis compositis spiravit crinibus aura, Atque habilis membris venit vigor. "Illic vero cum Homericæ simplicitate et veritate contendit Virgilio elegantia et ingenium: nam in *Odyssea* [iv.] v. 444 sqq. *ambrosiæ odor* iis, qui sub *phocærum* pellibus laterent, quam maxime erat quidem utilis, rei tamen ipsius parum jucunda narratio; at in nostro &c." Heyne. We confess that the present appears to be one of the many instances in which Virgil, by transferring to his own context an incident of Homer's, detached from the circumstances which in the original constituted its propriety, has rendered it altogether unmeaning. Why should *Aristæus*, any more than *Ulysses*, be endued with supernatural strength for the purpose of contending with *Proteus*? or, if this were necessary, why should it be done through the medium of anointing with oil, rather than by simple contact? besides, that the intention is obscurely expressed. In Homer the circumstance is significant; in Virgil it appears to be introduced merely for its own sake.

XXI. Ib. 559-566. Hæc super arborum cultu, &c. It is remarkable that Heyne, who gives it as his opinion "versus illos Georg. iv. subjectos a poeta vix profectos esse," (Prolegg. p. cc.) should have omitted to notice the supposition (of the truth of which we have no doubt) that the four last lines, and these only, are spurious. It is impossible that these four lines should have been written by Virgil; it is equally impossible that they should have been written by the author of the prece-

ding four; and it is scarcely possible that the latter should have been written by any but Virgil.

XXII. *Æn.* v. 23. *Nec littora longe Fida reor fraterna Erycis, portusque Sicanos* —. The word *fraterna* is certainly corrupt. Either of the two adjectives, standing by itself, would be elegant, and Virgilian; but the union of the two produces an awkwardness, of which there is no other example in Virgil. Read, *fraterni Erycis*; an emendation which had before suggested itself to Nicolas Heinsius, and which is indeed sufficiently obvious; yet we are pleased to find our opinions supported, even in trifles, by the authority of the excellent “*ospitation poëtarum Latinerum*.”

XXIII. *Æn.* vii. 33. *Quin protinus omnia Perlegerent oculis* —. “*Omnia* Grammaticorum et optimorum codd. est lectio —, ut per synizesin scilicet effereendum sit *omnipt*. La-brariorum inscitia mutavit in *omne*, quod ipse Romanus habet, *omnem, omnes, omne* —.” Heyne. We are not quite certain that *omne* (τὸ πᾶν) may not be the true reading. There is at least no other instance in Virgil of two short syllables at the end of a line coalescing into one; unless *Orphea*, *Æd.* vi. 19 may be considered as parallel.

XXIV. *Æn.* vi. 566. *Gnossius hæc Rhadamanthus habet durissima regna; Castigatque auditque doles* —. This procedure of the infernal judge has been made matter of ridicule, as reversing the equitable order of things. A satirical commonplace is too convenient a thing to be lost, or it might have been recollected that there is such a figure as ὁστέρον πρότερον, and that *castigatque auditque* might fairly be understood to mean *castigat auditos, τιμωρεῖ ἀκούσας*. The truth is, however, that neither in this nor in any other passage of Virgil is *castigare* used in the sense of *to punish*. Its proper meaning is *to correct, to reprove, or to reprove*. *Castigatque auditque*, he charges them with the crimes they have committed, and hears their confessions. The *punishment* follows, v. 570. *Continuo sontes ultrix accincta flagello Tisiphone quatit insultans* —.

XXV. Heyne Prolegg. ad Virg. p. ccviii. “Fuit tamen Guyeti acumen, quod quatuor extremos *Æneidos* libros Virgilio abjudicaret.” Even in the wildest errors there is some mixture of truth. The opinion above mentioned is undoubtedly much too absurd to need confutation; yet that there is a difference in point of style between the last four books and the eight preceding—a difference less palpable, indeed, but of the same

kind as that which subsists between the latter six books and the former—we have long been persuaded.

XXVI. *Æn.* ix. 2. *Irim de cœlo misit Saturnia Juno Audacem ad Turnum. Luco tum sorte parentis Pileum Turnus sacrata valle sedebat.* We have here three verses in succession, each containing no more than one dactyl. The Latin language runs naturally into spondee, as the Greek of Homer's time does into dactyls; a tendency of which Virgil appears to have been aware, and which he took some pains to counteract. He struggled with the cumbrousness of his own language, as Milton with the roughness of his. The difference between Latin and Greek in this respect will be evident from a comparison of the passages in which Virgil has imitated Homer with the originals, especially where the matter is such as to demand a peculiarly slow, or rapid, march of verse.

XXVII. *Æn.* xii. 142. *Nymphæ, decus fluviorum, animo gratissima nostro, Scis ut te cunctis unam, quæcunque Latine Magnanimæ Jovis ingratum ascendere cubile, Prætulerim, cælique libens in parte locarim. Disce tuum, ne me incenses, Iuturna, dolorem.* Perhaps: *Nymphæ* — *nostro*, (*Scis* — *locarim*) *Disce* — *dolorem*: according to the form of address so frequent in similar cases, where the Speaker begins with stating the reasons which induced him to make a particular communication or request, and then proceeds with the communication or request itself; and all within the compass of one sentence; as i. 65. *Æole*, (*namque tibi divum pater atque hominum rex Et mœcere dedit fluctus, et tollere vento*), *Gens inimica tibi Tyrhenum navigat æquer*, &c. vi. 56. *Phœbe*, *graves Trojæ semper miseræ labores, Dardani qui Paradis direxti tela manusque Corpus in Æacidæ; magnas obcuntia terras Tot maria intravi*, &c.

XXVIII. *Æn.* xii. 298. *Obvius ambustum torrem Corynæus ab ara Corripit, et venienti Ebuso, plagamque ferenti, Occupat os flammis*; &c. Heyne thinks that the Corynæus here mentioned cannot be the same with the one in *Æn.* vi. 228, on account of ix. 571. *Emathionæ Liger, Corynæum sternit Asylas*. It is more probable that his re-appearance is owing to an oversight of the poet's, as happens sometimes in Homer and Ariosto. Dryden transforms Corynæus into a priest militant, perhaps from a recollection of the part sustained by him in *Æn.* vi. and seizes the opportunity of indulging in one of his usual sneers at that body. *Cæterum* (as commentators say) the redoubted warrior before us appears to have bequeathed his

name to a still more formidable personage, namely, Corineus the companion of Trojan Brute, the conqueror of Cornwall, and slayer of the giant Goëmagog. Such adaptations of Trojan names are not uncommon in the fabulous history of Britain; e. g. Capis (i. e. Capys) an ancient king of the island, and Androgeus, nephew to Cassibelan.

The following specimen of erudition, from the article Polybius in the Edinburgh Encyclopædia, is too good to be lost.

“When *Perseus* was conquered, he [Polybius] was carried prisoner to Rome, &c.—His history of the Punic war, in thirty-eight books, comprehending a space of fifty-three years, is a valuable work. He likewise wrote an *Epitome* of Roman History, from the taking of Rome by the Gauls, five books of which only have been preserved entire, together with fragments of twelve more.”

Apollonius Rhod. iv. 977. πᾶσαι δὲ γάλακτι Εἰδόμεναι, χρυσέοις κεράεσσιν κυδιάσσκον. “Vera et legitima hæc est scriptura. In D. χρυσείῃς κεράεσσιν. In E. χρυσέοις κεράεσσι. Cæs. etiam et Medic. habent κεράεσσι. Vulgo χρυσείοισι κεράεσι. Poetica forma est κεράεσι, in qua semper corripitur α, quod in alia ejusdem nominis forma κεράεσσι producitur.” Brunck. In correcting a false quantity, Brunck has introduced a violation of rhythm equally offensive. The spirit and tenor of epic versification require that we should read χρυσέοισι κεράεσι. The same observation may be applied to Brunck’s unfortunate emendation, v. 895, τὰς μὲν ἄρ’ εὐειδὴς Ἀχελῷῳ εὐνηθεῖτα, for Ἀχελῷῳ, (κρείων Ἀχελῷος, Il. Φ.) and perhaps to some other verses of Apollonius, to which we are not able at present to refer.

Ib. 1077. ἡ δὲ νῦ (?) κούρη Αἰνοπαθὴς κατὰ μοι νόον ἔκλασεν ἀντίωσα. Μὴ μιν, ἄναξ, Κόλχοισι πόροις ἐς πατὴρ ἀγεσθαι. Correct — κατὰ μοι νόον ἔκλασεν, ἀντίωσα Μὴ μιν — ἀγεσθαι.

Milton, *Paradise Lost*, iii. 35. And Tiresias and Phineus, prophets old. Some of the commentators propose to expunge this line, others to transpose the names, alleging for a reason the harshness of its construction. But does the fault imputed really exist? or is the line unmetrical, merely because none such occur in Thomson, or Young, or Akenside? We once imagined that it must have been written in recollection of

Homer's hexameters—*Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο*, &c. But the fact is, that verses so formed are not unfrequent in Milton: Shoots invisible virtue ev'n to the deep, iii. 586. Through the infinite host, v. 874. In the visions of God, xi. 357. But to vanquish by wisdom bellish wiles, *Paradise Regained*, i. They are common in Italian poetry, from which it is probable that Milton adopted them. The remark is trifling, but we make it, because it gives us an opportunity of noticing the imperfect manner in which Milton's versification, as indeed every thing pertaining to his poems, (to say nothing of his prose works,) has been hitherto treated, owing to his having fallen into the hands of editors incapacitated, through prejudice, ignorance, or natural inability, to perform their office in a manner worthy of the subject.

ΒΟΛΗΤΟΣ.

---

## BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

---

IN observing on some statements of Professor Porson, in his controversy with Archdeacon Travis, relative to 1 John v. 7, I beg not to be reckoned among the number of those whom Dr. Jortin rather unceremoniously characterises as "stubborn and perverse people, who pretend to deny, after so full a discussion of the subject, that the *heavenly witnesses* are an interpolation." For I am inclined to think they are; and perhaps no arguments have tended more to create such a propensity, than those of Porson himself. It may, however, not be amiss, nor prejudicial to the cause which the Professor has advocated, and would be, no doubt, in accordance with his own wish, were he alive, (as we may gather from the conclusion of his preface,)—to point out a few slight inaccuracies of statement and ill-founded inferences, not at all affecting the main question, into which he seems to have fallen, perhaps through inadvertence, too much haste, or too short an examination.

At the commencement of the preface to his "Letters," respecting the authenticity of the verse in question, he mentions, as a circumstance *well known*, "that Colinaeus, in 1534, omitted the disputed verse, *on the faith of Mss.*" Of the truth of the latter part of this assertion, on its first perusal, I entertained some doubts, owing to a faint recollection I had of

the matter, by reading Simon's account of it in his *Critical History*. In his 4th Letter, Porson remarks on this point more at large, where it appears that his guides are Mill and Wetstein. But from the manner in which it is there treated, no sufficient reason prevailed with me to withhold assent to the opinion of Simon; in the absence, it must be confessed, of the *Prolegomena* to refer to, which supplied him with the information. This reference, however, may be supposed not necessary, as Porson will be considered to have made the *best* of his authorities. "Both Miji and Wetstein," says he, "allow that Colinaeus faithfully followed his manuscripts; and the latter rightly observes, that he (C.) had *few* guides to follow, and that his *poverty*, not his will, was to blame. These Mss., however, whether *good* or *bad*, *many* or *few*, omitted 1 John v. 7. If Colinaeus borrowed his Mss. from the royal library, they must have been some of those that were afterwards used by his son-in-law. If they were his *own*, or *lent* him by his friends, still it is most *probable* that Stephens knew of them, and *endeavored* to procure them for the service of his own edition. But *if* any Ms. of Colinaeus containing the catholic epistles was afterwards used by Stephens," &c.

Here is manifestly so much caution, conjecture, and uncertainty, that may we not, with ample reason, conclude, even from the above passage, the Mss. of Colinaeus to have been, if not a nullity, at least next to it? Have we not also adequate cause to suppose that Father Simon had as great facilities of collecting authentic information on this point, and that he exerted as much diligence and zeal, as Mill and Wetstein?

The edition of Colinaeus is among those quoted by Sandius, on which Simon expresses his unwillingness to place much reliance, as they were printed, not immediately from Mss., but on the credit of other printed editions. "Simon de Colines," says he, "*made no preface to his Greek edition*; which makes me think he compiled it, according to the best of his skill, by editions that were already extant."

The omission of 1 John v. 7. by Erasmus in his edition of the N. T. in 1516 and 1519, (though he admitted it in the subsequent ones,) was probably one cause among more why Colinaeus left it out in his edition of 1594. He, of course, knew under what circumstances Erasmus had been induced to insert it; he might have had his doubts as to the genuineness or value of the Codex Britannicus, and would, accordingly, prefer the reading of five authentic Mss. to that of one doubtful.

This view of the matter will somewhat detract from, if not destroy, the weight which was intended to be attached to the edition of Colmaus; and lead to the conclusion that, if all the evidence in proof of Colmaus' having used manuscripts has been adduced, Porson was rather too precipitate in citing so confidently that edition for his purpose, unless he held, that, in the absence of stronger proof, he had as much right to suppose that manuscripts were used in its compilation, as Simon had to think that it was taken from the printed editions. But is this latter inference consistent with Porson's known habits of correct research and management of a controversy?

In another part of his preface, there are some able strictures and judicious remarks on Gibbon and his celebrated history. And though it cannot be denied that his accusations are, for the most part, just and called for, it may yet be doubted if all his charges against the historian can be substantiated by reference to those particular passages of Gibbon's work to which Porson directs us in his notes. He reprehends him for "stooping to the most despicable pun, or to the most awkward perversion of language, for the pleasure of turning the Scripture into ribaldry, or of calling Jesus an impostor." For the first of these charges, that of turning the Scriptures into ribaldry, we are referred to a note under a certain chapter of the History; and there we find, instead of a pun on the words of Scripture, rather one on those of Bernard: for though the abbot, in this place, assumes the language of Isaiah, yet the objectionable word alluded to does not form a part of the quotation.

In proof of the accusation of calling our Saviour an impostor, we are directed to chap. xi. note 63, of the History. This note of Gibbon has reference to a passage in the text relative to Apollonius the Pythagorean philosopher, and not to Christ. It runs thus: "Apollonius of Tyana was born about the same time as Jesus Christ. His life (that of the former) is related in so fabulous a manner by his disciples, that we are at a loss to discover whether he was a sage, an impostor, or a fanatic." To any one who will take the trouble to look at the place, it will immediately appear evident, that any mention of our Saviour here, other than as it is, would have been entirely inapposite and irregular.

T. GRIMES.

Colchester, 1828.



## EXTRACTS FROM PERSIAN MANUSCRIPTS.

FOR the gratification of our numerous readers who are interested in the study of Eastern literature, and more particularly of the Persian language, we now fulfil the promise made on a former occasion, and lay before them the original texts of some passages given in *Italic* characters with English translations, in an article entitled "Extracts from Persian Manuscripts." (See *Class Journal*, No. LXVIII. p. 284. December, 1826.)

The distich quoted in *Benáketi's Chronicle*, beginning *Chún shír*, &c.

چون شیر ژبان بتو نماید دندان  
زنهار کمان مبر که هست او خندان

The distich from *Salmán Sáveji* beginning *Biábán ast*, &c.

بیابان است و شب تاریک و منزل دور و ما کُمره  
دلِیلی نیست غیر از تو خداوند اِرهی بنما

Next are the lines from *Oorfi*, beginning *Jehán begush-tem*, &c.

جهان بگشتم و دردا که هیچ شهر و دیار  
نیافتم که فروشد بخت در بازار

The tetrastich from *Omar Kheyám*,<sup>1</sup> beginning *Ber khíz*, &c.

برخیژ و دواي این دل تنگ بیار  
آن باده مشکبوي کلرنک پیار  
اجزای مفرح غم اَر میخواهی  
یا قوت می و بر بزم چنک بیار

---

<sup>1</sup> This poet died at *Nishapúr* (نیشاپور); a name through some mistake printed *Nishássur*, in *Classical Journal*, No. LXVIII. p. 286.

*Extracts from Persian Manuscripts. 255*

Then follows a passage from the *Masnavi*, beginning *Gufi maashúki*, &c.

گفت معشوقی بعاشق کای فتا  
 تو بغربت دیده بس شهرها  
 پس کدامین شهر ز آنها خوشتر است  
 گفت آن شهری که دروی دلبر است

Next is the epigram from *Cátebi*, beginning *Saadi 'Ardebili*, &c.

سعدی اردبیلی آنکه بطب  
 مثل او در جهان بشر نبود  
 هر کرا شربت می دهد بمرض  
 حاجت شربت می دگر نبود

The passage from *Saadi's Diván*, beginning *Gar tú gúny*, &c.

گر تو گویی حدیث عشق مگوی  
 این قدر حکم بر زبانم هست  
 لیکن از منع گریه غواهی کرد  
 دجله را پیش باز نتوان بست

The distich from one of *Háfes's* sonnets, beginning *Háfes cheh mánci*, &c.

حافظ چه مینهی تو دل بر خیال خوبان  
 کی تشنه سیر گردد از کعبه سرابی

Next is the *hhekáyet* (حکایت) or anecdote beginning *Der Herát mardí*, &c.

در هرات مردی بود اورا بابا گاو نام بود روزی با جمعی از  
 خوش طبعان بسیو صکرا می رفت گاوی از میان کله فریاد

کرد رفیقان پرسیدند که بابا کوا این چه میگوید گفت بامی  
میگوید که تواز جنس مای در میان خران چرا رفته

An anecdote from the same Ms. beginning ' *Vakti mowezéni*, &c.

وقتی موزنی بنک نماز بلندی گفت و می دوید مردی گفت  
ای احمد چرا میدوی گفت میگویند اواز تواز دور خوبست  
می خواهم صدای خود را از دور بشنوم

The death of Varanes, or *Baharam* surnamed *Gúr*, (گور) is related in a most valuable manuscript, the *Tárikh-i-Tabri* (تاریخ طبری) transcribed nearly four hundred years ago ; the anecdote beginning ' *An chunán búd*, &c.

آن چنان بود که یک روز بهرام بصید بر نشسته بود آهویی را  
دید از دور اسپ را بر انگیخت و می تاخت بدان بیابان  
اندر چاهی کهن بود ناکاه پای اسپ بر آن چاه فرو شد و  
اورا بجایه اندر افکند و خلع بیامدند و خواستند که اورا بر  
کشند اسپ را بر کشیدند و هر چند بهرام را جستند نیافتند  
پس مادرش بیامد و درم و دینار آورد و بر سر آن چاه بنشست  
و فرمود تا هر چه گل بود و آب بود از آن چاه بر آورند  
و سالیان بر سر چاه بنشست چون از نشستن ستوه آمد  
باز گشت با درد دل و هیچ اثر از شاه بهرام نیافتند

Here must be corrected two errors in this passage as printed in *Italic letters* (See *Class. Journ.* No. *LXVIII.* p. 289.): for *par* read *har* ; and for *áf* read *áb*.

Finally, the couplet beginning *Baharám keh gúr*, &c.

بهرام که گور می گرفتني همه عمر  
بنگر که چه گونه گور بهرام گرفت

## NOTICE OF

*BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA.* By J. LEMPRIERE, D.D. Re-edited by E. H. BARKER, ESQ. from the V<sup>th</sup> American edition by CHAS. ANTHON, ESQ. Adjunct Professor of Language, in Columbia College, New York; with an Appendix by MR. BARKER. 8vo. 16s. bds. Bohn, London, 1828.

OF the "march of intellect," in the present day, and of the objections to that phrase, who has not heard? Altering it to "progression of intellect," the book now before us may be cited as an instance. From the lamp of learning which illumines us at home, light is borrowed by natives of other regions; and, in the event, the boon returned, by reflecting it back with new lustre, and with benefit to ourselves who bestowed it.

The first projector of this work, he by whose counsel and under whose supervision it was first prepared, was, as we understand, the well-known, and universally respected, Dr. Valpy of Reading: its execution, indeed, devolved on his pupil and assistant, the late Dr. Lempriere; both of them natives of Jersey. After the lapse of forty years, the same work comes back to us from North America; is reprinted here, with an addition of new and amended articles, four thousand in number, as Professor Anthon tells us, (and we see no reason to suspect exaggeration,) made by the hand of a citizen of the United States.

Here, then, is a work of admitted utility; nay, indispensable to every votary of the classic muse; to the mature, as well as to the incipient scholar; which has been designed, executed, enlarged, improved, corrected, and not the hand of a native of England employed on it: wholly proceeding from the labor of scholars who have received English educations indeed, and are obliged to us for that information, which enables them, in their turn, to instruct those by whom they have been instructed. We do indeed view it as a singular circumstance regarding this very successful and useful work, that hitherto the name of no Englishman has appeared in preparing the numerous editions of a repertory used in all the schools in Great Britain, to which the master as well as the scholar, the college-student and the general reader, must resort, and which finds a place in every British library.

The first edition passed through the press in 1788, whilst its compiler was undergraduate of Pemb. Coll. Oxford. A second and much improved edition appeared in 1792; a third, in 1797. Whether in the editions subsequent to this any improvements were introduced by Dr. Lempriere himself, by others under his direction, or since his death, we have not the means of ascertaining. The last edition, numbered the fourteenth, dates in 1827.

So early as 1794, a Latin translation appeared at Deventer in Holland. The North American States possess six editions at least; of which the two last appeared under the direction of the present editor. His attention seems to have been directed, not exclusively, but principally, to the correction of the geographical portion of the work: in this department we were well aware that many, very many, defects and errors were to be found; the margin of our own Lempriere was stored with no small number of amendments, but we by no means anticipated that the quantum of these deficiencies could have amounted to that which the present editor brings to light. Our classical students are not yet fully aware how much their pursuits are aided by a knowledge of the German language: Professor Anthon's acquaintance with this, has enabled him to apply the stores of Mannert and Uckert, in addition to those of Malte-Brun and others, of whose writings Dr. L., for various reasons, had not availed himself.—In the biographical portion, also, great additions are made: in each, the authorities are detailed carefully, and, as far as our examination has proceeded, accurately.

Neither in the original preparation of this work, nor in the subsequent editions revised by Dr. L. himself, does any attention seem to have been paid to the present state of the countries which it names, or to the observations of modern travellers. This defect the American editor has, in a considerable degree, and as far as his limits admitted, taken pains to supply. Reference is made, occasionally, to modern descriptions of repute, such as Sir W. Gell's, Dr. E. D. Clarke's, Belzoni's, and others. This improvement alone gives great increased value to the present edition: it the more deserves notice as we do not perceive that the learned editor has in his preface dwelt on this portion of his labor, though certainly not inconsiderable.

Nothing can be more fair than the mode which he has adopted in distinguishing his additions: these are inclosed in square brackets; hence, even cursory inspection enables us to

judge on the proportion and value of the new matter, though not indeed of that which it supersedes.

"Along with the additions, which have been made to the present volume, the Editor has introduced whatever appeared new and interesting in the theories of the day. He has taken the liberty also of occasionally intruding theories of his own. Regarding these last with a partial eye, as every one is induced to regard the creations of his own imagination, he has been bold enough to place them by the side of other and more approved theories, not from the vain desire of instituting a comparison between his own and the labors of others, but that the presence of the latter might in some degree shield his own efforts from the animadversions of sober and cautious criticism. As regards the nature of some of the articles which have been just particularly enumerated, the reader will find under *Aristoteles* an enlarged biography of that philosopher; under *Carthago*, an account of the ancient Punic literature; under *Chaldaa*, a theory respecting the Slavonic origin of the Chaldaean race; under *Cicero*, an analysis of the works of that illustrious Roman; under *Cyclopes*, a theory respecting their location and the etymology of their name; under *Darius*, remarks on the value of that coin; under *Decemviri*, a theory respecting the origin of the Roman laws; under *Druïdes*, some remarks on that singular priesthood; under *Elusus*, an explanation of the probable object of the mysteries; under *Eridanus* and *Phaeton*, remarks respecting the existence, in former ages, of a milder temperature in the north of Europe; under *Falerius*, an account of the Roman wines, and the situation of the Falerian vineyards; under *Gigantes*, an argument against the possible existence, at any period, of a gigantic race; under *Græcia* and *Iones*, a theory respecting the movements and history of the earlier tribes of Greece; under *Hercules*, a theory identifying that hero with the sun; under *Hetruria*, a theory reconciling the conflicting opinions of the learned in relation to the origin of the Etruscians; under *Homerus*, remarks on the several theories which have been started respecting the poet and his works, and an attempt to prove that alphabetic writing was known in the age of Homer; under *Horatius*, remarks on the *Epistle to the Pisos*; under *Hyperborei*, a theory respecting the early settlements of the human race; under *Ierne*, remarks on the early religious system of Ireland; under *Imaus*, a full account of that remarkable chain; under *Josephus*, remarks on the works of that writer, and on the passage in which mention is made of our Saviour; under *Italia*, a theory respecting the early population of that country; under *Jupiter*, an analysis of the religion of Greece; under *Lacedæmon*, remarks respecting the affinity between the Lacedæmonians and Hebrews; under *Lætonia*, a theory respecting that ancient land, now sunk beneath the waters of the Mediterranean; under *Mediterræneum Mare*, a theory respecting the overflowing of the Hellespont, and the inundation of the northern coast of Africa; under *Melita*, remarks on the voyage of St. Paul; under *Memnonium*, a theory respecting the Egyptian Memnon; under *Mysale* and *Nepos*, corrections of the historian; under *Niger* and *Nilus*, a full account of those streams; under *Orpheus*, remarks on the several theories of the learned respecting the Orphic remains, and an attempt to prove that the ancient bard was of Indian origin; under *Pandora*, remarks on that old tradition, and an attempt to establish an analogy between it and the scrip-

tural account of the origin of evil; under *Pelasgi*, remarks on that singular race, and on the introduction of alphabetic writing into Greece; under *Pindarus*, remarks on his lyric productions; under *Plato*, remarks on the life and doctrines of that philosopher; under *Pomptinæ Paludes*, an historical account of the Pontine marshes; under *Pyramides*, an account of those structures, and a theory respecting their origin; under *Pythagoras*, remarks on the life and doctrines of that philosopher; under *Roma*, a theory respecting the true origin of Rome; under *Sphinx*, an account of the excavation of that monument; under *Syene*, remarks on the position of that place; under *Tacitus*, remarks on the dialogue *de Claris Oratoribus*; under *Taurus*, a full description of that range of mountains; under *Tentyra*, remarks on the famous zodiac; under *Theba*, remarks on the origin, history, and ruins of that famous city, and on the state of the arts in ancient Egypt, together with an account of the mummies; under *Thermopyla*, a description of that pass; under *Thule*, remarks on the probable location of that island; under *Troja*, remarks on the site of ancient Troy, and the true cause of the Trojan war; under *Varro*, an account of the life and writings of that learned Roman; under *Veneti*, a theory respecting their Sclavonic origin; under *Zeno*, remarks on the life of that philosopher, and the doctrines of the Stoic sect. Of these theories, the one on which most labor has been bestowed, and to which the attention of the student is particularly invited, is that respecting the true origin of Rome."

But it is time to cull a few of the flowers of this American garden; they may be compared with those continuing to decorate Dr. L's. parterre.

CANNÆ, a small village of Apulia near the Aufidus, where Hannibal conquered the Roman consuls, P. Æmilius and Terentius Varro, and slaughtered 40,000 Romans, on the 21st of May, B. C. 216. The spot where this famous battle was fought is now shown by the natives, and denominated the field of blood. [The Greek writers, especially Polybius, make the name singular. *Καννα*. There is an exception to this, however, in the 15th Book, c. 7 and 11, where the plural form is used by Polybius. This decisive victory was owing to three combined causes, the excellent arrangements of Annibal, the superiority of the Numidian horse, and the skilful manœuvre of Asdrubal in opposing only the light armed cavalry against that of the Romans, while he employed the heavy horse, divided into small parties, in repeated attacks on different parts of the Roman rear. The Roman army contained 80,000 infantry and 6000 cavalry, the Carthaginians 40,000 infantry and 10,000 cavalry. Annibal drew up his forces in the form of a convex crescent, having his centre thrown forward before the wings. He commanded in the centre in person, and here he had purposely stationed his worst troops; the best were posted at the extremities of each wing, which would enable them to act with decisive advantage as bodies of reserve, they being in fact in the rear of the other forces. Asdrubal commanded the left wing, Hanno the right. On the Roman side, want of union between the two consuls, and want of spirit among the men, afforded a sure omen of the fortune of the day. Æmilius commanded the right, Varro the left wing; the proconsuls Regulus and Servius, who had been consuls the preceding year, had charge of the centre. What Annibal foresaw took place. The charge of the

Romans, and their immense superiority in numbers, at length broke his centre, which giving way inwards, his army now assumed the shape of a *concave* crescent. The Romans in the ardour of pursuit were carried so far as to be completely surrounded. Both flanks were assailed by the veterans of Annibal, who were armed in the Roman manner; at the same time the cavalry of the Carthaginians attacked their rear, and the broken centre rallying, attacked them in front. The consequence was that they were nearly all cut to pieces. The two proconsuls, together with Æmilius the consul, were slain. Varro escaped with 70 horse to Venusia. The Romans lost on the field of battle 70,000 men: and 10,000 who had not been present in the fight were made prisoners. The Carthaginian loss amounted to 5500 infantry and 200 cavalry. Such is the account of Polybius, whose statement of the fight is much clearer and more satisfactory than that of Livy. Annibal has been censured for not marching immediately to Rome after the battle, in which city all was consternation. But a defence of his conduct may be found under the article Annibal, which see. *Polyb.* 3, c. 113 et seq.] *Liv.* 22, 44.—*Flor.* 2, 6.—*Plut.* in *Annib.*

VELLEIUS PATERCULUS, a Roman historian, descended from an equestrian family of Campania. [The year of his birth is commonly fixed at 19 B. C. the same year in which Virgil died.] He was at first a military tribune in the Roman armies, and for nine years served under Tiberius in the various expeditions which he undertook in Gaul and Germany. Velleius wrote an epitome of the history of Greece and of Rome, and of other nations of the most remote antiquity; but of this authentic composition there remain only fragments of the history of Greece and Rome from the conquest of Perseus by Paulus, to the 17th year of the reign of Tiberius, in two books. It is a judicious account of celebrated men and illustrious cities; the historian is happy in his descriptions; his pictures are true, and his narrations lively and interesting. The whole is candid and impartial, but only till the reign of the Cæsars, when the writer began to be influenced by the presence of the emperor, or the power of his favorites. Paterculus is deservedly censured for his invectives against Pompey, and his encomiums on the cruel Tiberius, and the unfortunate Sejanus. Some suppose that he was involved in the ruin of this disappointed courtier, whom he had extolled as a pattern of virtue and morality. [The work of Paterculus is entitled *Historia Romana*, but it is possible that this appellation may be owing to the copyists. A single manuscript of the work was preserved at the convent Murbach in *Alsace*, where Beatus Rhenanus found it. This manuscript, which was in a very bad condition, was subsequently lost. Its place is supplied by the edition of Rhenanus, published in 1520, and by a collation of the manuscript, made by Burer before Rhenanus returned it to the convent from which he had borrowed it. This collation is added to the edition of 1546. The history of Paterculus does not enter into details. It is a general picture of the times rather than a narrative of individual events. The historian states merely results, and is silent respecting the causes which combined to produce them. He loves, however, to develope and draw the characters of the principal actors, and his work is filled with delineations traced by the hand of a master. We find in him also a great many political and moral observations, the fruit of experience and foreign travel. In his style he imitates the concise and energetic manner of Sallust. His diction is pure and elegant, without, however, being wholly



free from affectation, which shows itself in the search for archaisms or antiquated forms of expressions, and in the too frequent use of moral sentences and figures of rhetoric. Some hellenisms are also found in him. The charge of adulation to his prince, which is so often brought against this historian, may find some palliation in the fact that it was not until after the death of Sejanus that the tyrannical spirit of Tiberius began openly and fully to develop itself; and of this, if Velleius was involved in the fate of Sejanus, he could not of course have been a witness. Besides, Tiberius had been the military chief, and the benefactor of Paterculus. The latter praises the good deeds he performed, he exaggerates his merit, he treats with indulgence his faults; but he does not push flattery so far as blindly to alter the truth, or assert things that are false. It is unjust, therefore, on account of this venial failing, to rank Paterculus among historians who are undeserving of confidence. He is impartial in the recital of events of which he was not himself a witness. As for those which passed under his own eyes, where is the historian who, in writing the history of his own times, is wholly exempt from the charge of partiality? The best editions of Paterculus are those of Ruhnkenius, 8vo. 2 vols. L. Bat. 1779; of Barhou, Paris, 12mo. 1777, and of Burmann, 8vo. L. Bat. 1719; [but above all that of Krause, Lips. 1800, 8vo.]—Caius, the grandfather of the historian of that name, was one of the friends of Livia. He killed himself when old and unable to accompany Livia in her flight.

CHALDÆA, [a country of Asia at the top of the Persian gulf, and south of Babylonia. Some writers, however, make Babylonia a part of it. With respect to the origin of the Chaldeans, who are called in Scripture *Chasdim*, various opinions have been entertained. Michaelis considers them as a foreign race in Assyria, and is inclined to derive them from the Chalybes of the Greek geographers, who are called Chaldi by Stephanus Byzantinus. His chief reason for this opinion is founded on the names of Chaldean and Babylonian kings preserved in Scripture, and by Ptolemy and Syncellus, which differ from the Assyrian names, and bear an apparent resemblance to those of some northern nations of Slavonic origin. Thus Nebucadnezzar would be in Slavonic, *Nebu-godnoi-tzar*, i. e. a prince worthy of heaven. Belshazar would be equivalent to *Bolshoi-tzar*, i. e. a great prince; and so of others. (See the supplement to Michaelis's work on the Hebrew Laws, sect. 1367, and his *Spicilegium Geographiæ Hebræorum cetera*, vol. 2. p. 77, et seqq.) On the other hand, Adelung contends that all these names are resolvable into the Hebrew, or its cognate dialects. This author considers the Chaldeans or Chasdim, as a mountaineer people from the north of Mesopotamia, but belonging to the Assyrian, or, as he calls it, the Shemitic race. (See his *Mithridates, Erster Theil*. p. 517, and also *Rosenmüller on Hab.* 1, 6, and *Gesenius's larger Hebrew Lexicon*, p. 489.) The Chaldean are highly commended in many of the ancient writers for their skill in the sciences, especially in astronomy. If we are to believe Diodorus, however, their claims to this high character were very slight. They seem to have pursued the study of astronomy no farther than as it might tend to aid their fancied astrological researches. They taught that the shape of the earth was that of a skiff or small boat; and of eclipses of the sun they knew but little, and never ventured to predict them, or fix the time of their occurring. So says Diodorus. *Diod. S.* 2, 31.—*Aul. Gell.* 14, 1.—*Sext. Emp.* 338.—*Montucla Hist. de Math.* V. 1. l. 2, §. 4.]

Unfortunately for this etymological reverie, of the alliance of Slavonic and Chaldaean, we have always understood that the Russian term "Czar" is a mere modern corruption of the Teutonic title "Kaiser;" and that, of the Roman Cæsar.

**MITHRIDATES.** Though both Dr. L. and Prof. Anthon admit from Herodotus a proper name written *Mithradates*, (derived apparently from the name of the Persian divinity, Mithras,) they do not notice Dr. E. D. Clarke's conjecture, (*Trav.* i. 421.) indeed, more than conjecture, that the latter name was that really borne by this mighty monarch, and that *Mithridates* is a mere Roman corruption; the vowels *i* and *a* appearing to be confounded by them in various other instances.

**BELLEROPHON:** as usual, this name is given without remark: Bellerophonotes is that given by Homer, *Il.* ζ. 190.

The value of the edition before us, is increased by appending to it a complete chronological list, prepared by Faccioliati, of all writers in the Latin tongue, from the earliest of whom we have fragments, down to the 16th century; a list of grammatical works in various languages, and other matter. We could have wished that the learned editor, Mr. Barker, had increased the obligation, by giving in this *Appendix* a list of Latin appellatives, coined in modern times, applied to towns and places. We possess books which the title-pages state to be printed in places bearing well-sounding Roman names, but ubi terrarum situated, no map can tell us. In a Latin tract, recently published in Germany itself, we have seen the capital of Austria named Vienna; but Professor Anthon tells us, and tells us truly, that its proper Latin term is Vindobona; and that Vienna is a French city. Whimsically enough, we ourselves, in our own tongue, persist in giving to the Austrian capital this name; Latinizing probably the French name, which approaches very nearly the real appellation, Wien.

Considerable improvement may yet be made in this valuable work: greater clearness of detail may be attained with economy of space. In biography, one undeviating mode of arranging the memoir of each individual should be adopted: as thus. After the name, 1st, if known, father's name: 2nd, where born: 3rd, when: 4th, incidents of his life, always observing, as nearly as may be, the order of time: 5th, character, and general remarks: 6th, place and time of death, where known, and important to state: finally, authorities; and if the subject of the memoir be himself an author, the best edition and translation in your own tongue. In geography; 1st, situation, and bounds: 2nd, modern name, if any: 3rd, of distinguished

## 264 Notice of Dr. Crombie's *Gymnasium*, &c.

cities, lat. and long. : 4th, historical narration attached to the place, but generally more brief than in preceding editions, and with more strict attention to the order of time : 5th, authorities. In giving the latter, one uniform mode should be pursued ; a list of abbreviations prefixed, and every citation carefully conforming : the book or other larger partition of the work quoted, in Roman numerals ; the minor, in Arabic. Il. and Odys. in the small Greek letters. Some single letters in another type, as abbreviations, might be advantageously introduced : for instance—F. F. for father ; B. B. for born ; D. D. for died ; O. O. for Olympiad.

---

NOTICE OF  
*GYMNASIUM, SIVE SYMBOLA CRITICA*  
By the Rev. ALEXANDER CROMBIE, LL.D.  
2 vols. 8vo. Third edition, corrected and enlarged.  
London, printed for R. Hunter, 72, St. Paul's  
Church-yard. 1828. pp. 342. 486.

*CLAVIS GYMNASII, Editioni tertiæ accommodata,  
sive Exercitationes in Symbolam Criticam, partim  
sicut in veteribus extant, datæ, et partim a Rev.  
ALEX. CROMBIE, LL.D. Latine redditæ. Londini,  
1828. 8vo. pp. 112.*

---

WE are doubtful whether this useful work, of which the public have expressed no small approbation, by inducing the author to publish a third edition, corrected and enlarged, would not have been much more extensively used in our classical schools and academies, if Dr. Crombie had selected a title better calculated to convey to the minds of those, who see it advertised, the idea that it is designed as a series of rules for Latin composition, very clearly, logically, and philosophically expressed. Synonyms are fully and correctly explained. The usages of verbs and nouns and adverbs &c. are amply illustrated. Indeed, we may say with truth that there is no English work of its size so well calculated to assist those who desire to acquire a good Latin style, and none in use which handles the subject on sounder principles of philology and philosophy ; and we strongly recommend it to the attention of the schoolmaster, and the college-student, as excellently adapted for their purposes.

Without more space than can be allowed to us, we cannot prove the propriety of our remarks by quotations of sufficient length. The present edition is accompanied by a *Key*, which will make the book still more useful. Dr. Crombie states in his *Preface* that in the *Key* he has rarely ventured to deviate from the language of the classic, from whom the passages have been selected. This statement refers, we presume, to the text in the *Clavis*, and not to the notes. We, however, find the deviations in the text to be pretty numerous; and Dr. Crombie has given the originals in the notes, and frequently without referring to the authors. Now it would have been more natural to have reserved the notes for his own modes of translation, and to have uniformly given the originals in the text;—we would recommend Dr. Crombie to adopt this plan in the next edition. In delivering his rules for the construction of *qui*, Dr. C. states that, where the sentiment expressed is not that of the historian, or the speaker, but of the person, of whom he is writing or speaking, the relative is joined with the subjunctive mood; and as one or two expressions occur in Livy, as *de quo agitur*, for *de quo agatur*, contrary to this rule, which Drackenborch and other critics have noticed, but have not attempted to explain, we should be glad to see the cause of the peculiarity accounted for, and, if possible, reconciled with the rule given by the author.

---

### • NOTICE OF

CLASSICAL MANUAL; or, *A Mythological, Historical, and Geographical Commentary on Pope's Homer, and Dryden's Æneid of Virgil; with a copious Index.* London, Longman, 1827. 8vo. Pr. 18s. boards, pp. 698.

---

WE always think it the best and fairest plan to let the author tell his own tale; and as the *Advertisement* prefixed to the book is very short, we shall lay the whole of it before our readers:—

“The study of Homer and Virgil being considered an essential part of polite education, the young might, it was presumed, derive some advantage from a work intended as a companion to those poets. The author has endeavored to comprise, in the following pages, the more material circumstances relative to the mythology, religious rites, customs, fables, traditions, authentic history, and geography of the

ancients. A judicious execution of this design would present a great variety of information, which can otherwise not be attainable but by laborious research, and by reference to many scarce and expensive publications. The author has, therefore, spared no pains in collecting information from works of the highest authority; excluding, at the same time, whatever exceptionable language incidentally occurs in the history and mythology of the classical writers.

"A very copious Index is subjoined, which will supply whatever convenience might have been derived, if this work had assumed the form and plan of a Classical Dictionary."

This book will be found as useful to those, who are unacquainted with the dead languages, as to those who are conversant with them; it is philological, not critical. We have examined it carefully in many instances, and we are able to state confidently that it has been compiled with great care, and contains a great variety of valuable information very proper and necessary for the student. The language is correct, concise, neat, and perspicuous; the mode of treating the subject is exact and methodical; the subjects themselves are amply discussed, and we have discerned no mythological fancies, no love of systematising ancient symbolic representations, nothing against which we need guard the reader. Good sense pervades the work, and sound knowledge, drawn from the best sources, is diffused through its pages. We cordially thank the author, —we strongly recommend the book,—we predict its success,—and we hope that he will undertake other literary labors equally useful to the rising generation.

---

## ADVERSARIA LITERARIA:

NO. XLV.

---

- I. "BOTANY is an active science, and the discoveries of the torrid zone might enrich the Herbal of Dioscorides with two thousand plants."—Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. 52.

Gibbon has been suspected of falling into mistakes by quoting from works of which he had read no more than the preface, but in this passage he has been guilty of referring to an author with whose title-page he was evidently unacquainted. The title of Dioscorides' work is *Ἐπεὶ ὅλης ἱατρικῆς*; and it is therefore not a herbal, but a treatise on the *Materia Medica*. Now, although the number of medicinal herbs introduced into the practice of medicine by the discovery of America be no doubt

very considerable, it is certain that they fall far short of 2000. As a proof of this, I may mention that a late edition of the Edinburgh *Materia Medica* does not contain more than 250 articles altogether, although it includes all the substances supplied by the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms of nature. So much for Mr. Gibbon's acquaintance with the *Materia Medica* of Dioscorides !

II. "The Physics both of the Academy and the Lyceum, as they are built, not on observation, but on argument, have retarded the progress of real knowledge."—Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. 52.

It certainly does appear a very strange reason for condemning a system of philosophy, because it is founded on argument ! On this principle the philosophy of Locke, and ever that of Sir Isaac Newton, must fall to the ground. It evinces a corresponding ignorance of Aristotle's *Auscultationes Naturales*, to say that his *Physics* were not founded on observation ; for that philosopher every where maintains that all abstract knowledge must be originally derived from the observation of particulars, and inculcates that the object of science is to reduce facts to first principles. How this mode of cultivating science could retard real knowledge it is difficult to perceive.

III. "In the Peripatetic philosophy, what takes place in *sensation* was thus described: a sort of images, or, as they were termed, *sensible species*, that is, certain films of the shape of bodies came off, it was said, from the objects of sense, and arriving at the organs which were proper to them, were admitted to the nerves, and by them conveyed to the brain : there these images were impressed, as the engraving of a seal on wax, and being now refined into what were called *intellectual species*, the whole business of sensation and perception was supposed to be accounted for."—*Library of Useful Knowledge*, or the *Novum Organ. Scient.* p. 1.

He who will point out to me in what part of Aristotle's works this hypothesis of sensation is to be found, shall be called *Davus* ! His theory of vision, as delivered in his work *De Anima*, (lib. ii. c. 7.) is most rational, and very little different from the Newtonian : and neither in this treatise, nor in that *De Sensu et Sensili*, will the reader find any such absurd doctrine, as that which is here ascribed to him. I fear the "*Library of Useful Knowledge*" will ill deserve its title, if the authors of it are not more careful to avoid mistakes in stating the opinions of the great masters of ancient wisdom.

IV. Στέμματ' ἔχων ἐν χερσὶν ἐκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος,  
Χρυσέῳ ἀνὰ σκήπτρῳ.—Hom. Il. A. l. 14.

Commentators have been strangely puzzled about the signification of the preposition ἀνὰ in this passage; but the following quotation from Pindar, where the same expression occurs, seems to me to point out the exact meaning of it:

Εὐδαι δ' ἀνὰ σκάπτῳ Διὸς αἰετός.—Pyth. i. 10.

Here the meaning evidently is, that the eagle sits perched *upon* the sceptre of Jupiter; which the Scholiast explains by these words, ὁ αἰετὸς ἐπικαθήμενος τῷ τοῦ Διὸς σκήπτρῳ κ. τ. λ. and the poet Grey elegantly and literally translates,

“Perch'd upon the sceptred hand  
Of Jove, thy magic lulls the feather'd king.”

Ode to Music.

Judging from this example, there can, I think, be no doubt but that Homer's meaning is, that the priest bore in his hand a sceptre, to the upper extremity of which were attached the fillets of the god. Hence the fillets were said to be *upon* the sceptre.

V. “Βοῶ γὰρ κῦμα χερσαῖον στρατοῦ.

Æschyli Sept. contr. Theb. l. 64.

*Jam enim terrestres exercitus fluctus reboant.* “Βοῶ γὰρ κῦμα designat incedentis exercitus strepitum et clamorem, equorum sonitum, armorum stridorem. Hæc omnia una metaphora non magis audaci quam commoda extulit.” Schutz. Audax sane est metaphora, sed mixta et incongruens. Acies exercitus apte comparari potest cum fluctibus; non autem terrestres fluctus bene dicitur. Errarunt tamen et Schutz et Blomfield χερσαῖος interpretantes *terrestres* ab Hesychio in errorem ducti. Significat *Littoralis*, a χέρσος, Littus. Hom. Il. E. 394.

Οὔτε θαλάσσης κῦμα τόσον βοῶα προτὶ χέρσον.

Κῦμα χερσαῖον igitur est, *fluctus littoralis*, vel *fluctus ad littus collisus*: hoc sensu bene congruit cum βοῶ. *fluctus ad littus collisus reboat.*—From the Notes on Æschylus in the Collect. Gr. Majora, vol. iii. p. 136.

Professor Dunbar is certainly mistaken in asserting that χέρσος does not signify *terra*, nor χερσαῖος *terrestres*; for this is unquestionably their proper signification. Examples of both being used in this sense are of ready occurrence. Thus:

Τὴν γὰρ ἐν πόντῳ κυβερνῶνται θαλά

Nāes, ἐν χέρσῳ τε λαίψηροὶ πόλεμοι.—Pind. Ol. xii. 4.

Here χέρσος is evidently put for *dry land*, in contradistinction to πόντος *the sea*. The note of the Scholiast is, ἐν τῇ χέρσῳ

ἀντὶ τοῦ τῆ γῆ. The following example of χέρσοθεν is also very decisive of the signification of this word :

ἄνθεμα δὲ χρυσοῦ φλέγει,  
τὰ μὲν χερσοθέν, ἀπ' ἀγλαῶν δενδρέων  
"Ἴδωρ δ' ἄλλα φέρβει.—Pind. Ol. ii. 134.

In both these examples the signification of *shore* is clearly quite out of the question.

Examples of χερσαῖος being put to signify *land animal*, in contradistinction to θαλάττιος or ἐνυδρος, a *sea* or *water animal*, occur very frequently in Aristotle's *History of Animals*, in Theophrastus' *History of Plants*, and in Dioscorides' *Materia Medica*. Thus, the author last mentioned entitles one of his chapters περὶ χερσαίου σκορπίου, de terrestri scorpionē, i. e. concerning the *land scorpion*. In like manner Aristotle, εἰς δὲ διαφόραι (τῶν ζώων) κατὰ τοὺς βίους καὶ τὰς πράξεις καὶ τὰ ἦθη—αἰτίαι δὲ ἢ τὰ μὲν ἐνυδρά ἐστιν αὐτῶν, τὰ δὲ χερσαῖα.—De Hist. An. lib. i. c. 1. And in like manner Theophrastus : περὶ δὲ βραχυβιότητος φυτῶν καὶ δένδρων, τῶν μὲν ἐνύδρων ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἔχομεν, ὡς ἂν καθόλου λέγοντες ὅτι βραχυβιώτερα τῶν χερσαίων ἐστὶ, κ. τ. λ.—De Hist. Plant. lib. iv. c. 14.

VI. Ἄλλ' οἶον τὸν Τηλεφίδην κατενῆρατο χαλκῷ  
"Ἡρῷ Εὐρύπυλον· πολλοὶ δ' ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἐταῖροι  
Κήτειοι κτείνοντο, γυναιῶν εἵνεκα δώρων.

Odys. lib. xi. 518.

Professor Dalzel (Collect. Gr. Maj. vol. ii. p. 52.) has the following note on this passage : "Obscurus habetur hic locus ob defectum historiæ. Alii aliter interpretantur. Κήτειος a quibusdam redditur *ad magna marina animalia pertinens*, unde *valde magnus*. Aliis est nomen populi in Mysia." The Κήτειοι are frequently made mention of in the sixth book of Quintus Smyrnæus, in which the exploits of Eurypylus are celebrated. He says of their country,

ὅσφι δολιχοῖο παρὰ προχοῇσι Καϊκοῦ  
Ναίεσκον—

τῶν μεθ' Ὀμηρ. τ'.

Now we know that the Caicus was a river of Mysia, and hence it is called by Virgil

— Mysusque Caicus.—Georg. iv. 370.

There can be no doubt then that the Κήτειοι were Mysians. Joannes Tzetzes calls Eurypylus likewise a Mysian.

Εὐρύπυλος δ' ἐπικούρος Τρωσὶν ἐπήλυθεν αὐθις  
Τηλεφίδης μεγάλθυμος, Μυσὸς, ἐπῆρτος ἀνάξ.  
τὰ μεθ' Ὀμηρ. 519.



- VII. "No useless coffin inclosed his breast,  
Not in sheet nor in shroud we wound him,  
*But he lay like a warrior taking his rest*  
With his martial cloak around him.

\* \* \* \* \*

We spoke not a word of sorrow,  
*But stedfastly gazed on the face that was dead."*

Wolfe's Ode on the Death of Sir John Moore.

Probably the author of these lines had in his mind the following splendid verses of Quintus Smyrnaeus on Achilles, as he lay dead in the camp of the Greeks.

Ἀργείους δ' ἔλε θάμβος ὁμιλαδὸν ἀθρήσαντας  
Πηλεΐδην ζώντι πανέκελον ὅς ῥ' ἐπὶ λείτροις  
Ἐκχόμενος, μάλα πούλῳς, ἄδην εὖδοντι ἐώκει.

Lib. iii. 543.

Even this seems to have been copied from Bion's lovely picture of Adonis as he lay on his funeral bed of roses:

Καὶ νέκυς ἂν καλὸς ἐστί, καλὸς νέκυς οἷα καθεύδων.

- VIII. Si quando sedem angustam servataque mella  
Thesauris relines; prius haustu sparsus aquarum  
Ore fove, fumosque manu prætende sequaces.

Virg. Georg. IV. 228.

Dr. Hunter, and I believe most of the ancient editors of Virgil, still continue the reading of *ore* instead of *ora*, which Heinsius had restored on manuscript authority; but I am at a loss to comprehend what distinct meaning they attach to the passage. They appear, indeed, to understand that Virgil directs the person who intends to rob a hive of its contents, in the first place, to fill his mouth with water, and then to squirt it on the bees; which is no doubt quite intelligible, but it is an inversion of the order of Virgil's words which I cannot think at all warrantable. Instead of this they make Virgil deliver instructions, in the first place, to discharge a mouthful of water on the bees, and then to fill the mouth with water; for this appears to be the signification which they attach to *ore fove*. Now Virgil is not in the practice of expressing himself in this lame manner; and, rather than suppose so, we ought to suspect ourselves of misunderstanding his meaning.

In order to find out the real signification of this passage, it may be of use to examine what was the actual mode of proceed-

ing which the ancients adopted on such occasions as that which Virgil is here describing; and fortunately we have a minute description of the whole process given us by Paxamus in the Greek Geoponics. It is as follows:

Τρυγῶντα μέλι μὴ τύπτεσθαι. Παξάμου.

Τηλέως πεφυγμένης ἀλεύρου, καὶ μαλάχης ἀγρίας ἀποχύλισμα παραχέας σὺν ἐλαίῳ, μέλιτός τε πάχος ποιήσας, ἐπίχρει τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ τὰ γυμνά τοῦ σώματος δαψιλῶς, καὶ ῥοφήσας ἐμψύσῃσιν εἰς τὴν μελισσίαν τρεῖς ἢ τετράκις. Καὶ ἀναψύξας πυροβόλιον εἰς χυτρίδιον, καὶ προσαγαγὼν τῷ θυριδίῳ, ἄφες εἰσκρίνεσθαι τὸν καπνὸν ἐφ' ἡμιώριον, ἐπάρας τε κράτει ἔξω πρὸ χυτρίδιον ὅπως ὁ καπνὸς ἔξω περιττεύῃ, καὶ οὕτω τρύγα.

Ut vindemiator mellis non pungatur. Paximi.

Ad farinam fœnigræci torrefactam malvæ sylvestris succum affunde cum oleo, factaque mellis spissitudine, *faciem et nudas corporis partes plurimum illinc*; inde etiam sorbeto, et in alvearia ter aut quater sufflato. Ferrum ignitum in olla restinguito, et admota fenestellæ alvearii, fumum ad dimidium horam irrumperere sinito, et postea elevatam ollam foris teneto, quo fumus foris redundet, atque sic vindemiato.—Geopon. lib. xv. c. 6.

It appears, then, that the practice of the ancients was, that the person employed anointed his face with a certain composition; then he squirted water from his mouth on the bees; and lastly, he attacked the hive with smoke in the manner described above. It is evident, therefore, that the words ἐπίχρει τὸ πρόσωπον in Paximus' description correspond with *ora fove* in Virgil's, and consequently there can be no doubt but that this is the correct reading. The following then seems to be the meaning of this passage: "When you wish to get hold of the contents of a hive, having squirted water on the bees, *besmear your own face*, and then bring a smoking-vessel, &c."

It will be remarked that I agree with Servius in taking *spar-sus* in an active signification.

IX. "Dionysius undertakes to prove that the Romans were of Greek origin, and he tells us that it is proved.—Æneas himself tells Latinus that he and his companions are Trojans, and of a city not the least illustrious among the Greeks, which the Achæans had deprived him of. Latinus answers, 'I am partial to all the Greeks.' I apprehend that there is nothing in Sallust, Livy, Tacitus, Florus, Aurelius Victor, or Eutropius, to confirm or countenance this."—Classical Journal, No. LXVIII.

I never could see any good grounds for the scepticism of some modern authors regarding the Trojan origin of the Ro-

mans, or the Greek descent of the Trojans. That the Romans were sprung from the Trojans seems to me satisfactorily proved by the concurrent testimony of the most respectable Greek and Latin historians, by the popular tradition of the country, and by the circumstance mentioned by the Halicarnassian, that seventy families of the Roman nobility traced their genealogy to Trojan ancestors. There is a passage in Aristotle's *Politics*, (lib. vii. c. 10.) which I have always considered of great importance, as confirming the stories told by the Romans regarding their remote ancestors. After making mention of the system of government established by Minos in Crete, he says, that the Italian constitutions were far more ancient than his, and mentions Italus as having been king of Ænotria, and having given his name to the country. Now, if the very ancient legends of Ænotrus and Italus were founded on truth, surely much more credit is due to the comparatively recent one of Æneas and his Trojan companions.

Aristotle, also, in another place, takes notice of Trojan captives, which were said to have been brought to Italy by Diomed.—*Mirab. Auscultat.*

The Greek origin of the Trojans, likewise, is proved by the most unexceptionable evidence, besides that of Dionysius.—Servius, the commentator on Virgil, states very decidedly that the Trojans were allied to the Athenians. His words are, "Trojani autem præter Dardanum et Teucrum etiam ab Atheniensibus originem ducunt, unde et Minervam colunt. Hinc est in Secundo, Neu populum antiqua sub religione teneri. *Antiqua*, id est ab Atheniensibus tradita. *Iliacis*, ergo Atheniensibus, unde Ilienses dedicerunt.—*Comment. in Æn. iii. 278.*

The relationship of the Trojans to the Athenians may be inferred also from the alliance of both to the Thracians. Thus we learn from the unexceptionable authority of Homer, that the Thracians were among the auxiliaries of Priam in his war with the European Greeks under Agamemnon. Virgil (*Æn. iii. l. 15.*) calls Thrace "*Hospitium antiquum Trojæ.*" Servius has the following commentary on these words: "*Aut charum aut revera antiquum. Nam tanta inter ipsos familiaritas fuit ut Ilione filia Priami Polymestori nuberet.*"—In like manner, Euripides (*Hecub. l. 7.*) calls Polymestor *Θράκιος ξένος* of the Trojans.

That the inhabitants of Thrace and Attica were anciently allied by consanguinity, is evident from the circumstance that both were called Ionians. See Hesychius, in voce *Iones*. Strabo (lib. vii.) mentions that Eumolpus, a Thracian, brought a colony to Attica; and Hyginus (*Fab. xlv.*) says, that he

claimed Attica as his inheritance. Now this Thracian Eumolpus was the father of the celebrated Musæus, who established the system of mythology in Greece (Diogenes Laertius in Proœm.). Seuthes, the Thracian king, is represented by Xenophon (Anab. vii.) as calling the Athenians his kinsmen. On the connexion of the Thracians with the Athenians, I have treated more fully in a small work on Greek and Latin syntax, entitled "Hermes Philologus." See p. 23.

If, therefore, the inhabitants of Troy and of Attica were severally connected with Thracians, they must also have been allied to one another; and as the Athenians were indisputably Greeks, the inference seems clear that their kinsmen the Trojans were Greeks likewise.

In proof of the Grecian origin of the Trojans, Professor Blackwell (on the writings of Homer) justly remarks, that their names, as given by Homer, are all derived from the Greek language. As, for example, *Πρίαμος*, *Ἀλέξανδρος*, *Πολύδαμος*.

F. A.

*Banchory-Ternan, March 18, 1828.*

The following lines, written by Dr. Friend, in memory of Evan Rice, huntsman to Lord Mansel, of Margam in Glamorganshire, are inscribed on a brass plate, affixed to the wall in the south aisle of the church at Margam.

Vos qui colitis Hubertum  
Inter divos jam repertum,  
Cornuque quod concedens fati  
Reliquit vobis insonatis;  
Latos solvite clamores  
In singultus et dolores;  
Nam quis non tristi sonat ore  
Conclamato venatore?  
Aut ubi dolor justus nisi  
Ad tumultum *Evan* *Rice*?  
Ilic per abrupta et per plana  
Nec tardo pede nec spe vana,  
Canibus et telis egit  
Omne quod in silvis degit;  
Hic evolavit mano puro  
Et cervis ocyor et Euro;  
Venaticis intentus rebus  
Tunc cum medius ardet Phœbus;  
Indefessus adhuc quando  
Idem occidit venando.  
At vos venatum illo ducti  
Alia non surgetis luce:  
Nam Mors, mortalium venator  
Qui ferina nunquam satur,  
Cursum prævertit humanum  
Proh dolor! rapuit *Evanum*:

Nec meridiq̃s, nec aurora  
 Vobis reddent ejus ora ;  
 Restat illis nobis flenda  
 Nox perpetua dormienda ;  
 Finivit multa laude motum  
 In ejus vita longe notum,  
 Reliquit equos, cornu, canes,  
 Tandem quiescunt ejus manes  
     Evano Riso  
     Thomas Mansel  
     Servo fideli  
     Dominus benevolus.  
     p — ob.  
     1702.

---

*Verses written by DR. RAMSDEN in 1784, on being prevented from reading the Grace in Hall on Trinity Sunday along with Mr. Bell, the distinguished Chancery Barrister, on account of their personal appearance.*

Ecce meum *primum* ! torpet, calet, angit et ardet ;  
 Est vitæ sedes, est tibi grande decus.  
 At (miserum dictu!) *foedum* mihi *tabe secundum* est ;  
 Sæpe ferus lanius miles et ipse videt.  
 De *toto* quæ clara feram ? cum floret, ovamus,  
 Cum *cecidit* pævis tunc sumus atque cinis.

---

*By* PROFESSOR PORSON.

Totum pone, fluit ; caput aufer, splendet in armis ;  
 Caudam deme, volat ; viscera tolle, dolet.

---

Te *primum* incauto nimium propiusque tuenti,  
 Laura, mihi furtim surripuisse queror :  
 Non tamen hoc furtum tibi condonare recusem,  
 Si pretium tali solvere merce velis :  
 Sed quo plus candoris habent tibi colla secundo,  
 Hoc tibi plus *primum* frigoris intus hæbet.  
 Sæpe sinistra cavâ cantavit ab ilice totum,  
 Omina et audaces spes vetat esse ratas.

---

*Inscription on a monument in Sprowston Church, Norfolk, to the memory of LADY MARIA MICKLETHWAIT, who died in child-bed.—The infant, a son, survived.*

I quære, lector, an non sit *lucrum* mori,  
 Cùm vitam moriens dat et accipit,  
 Mortalem nato, æternam sibi.

## CANONS AND REMARKS

*On the Tragedies of Æschylus as edited by Dr. Blomfield.*

---

*Prometheus Vincitus.*

1. THE ancient Greek poets sometimes lengthened *a* privative, and in *ἀθάνατος*; always. 193.

2. *Ἐπιθής*, not *εὐπειθής*, is the proper form in the Tragic writers. It is formed from the second aorist, as *εὐγενής*, *εὐσταλής*, *εὐλαβής*, and many others. 341.

3. The Athenians were accustomed to estimate the nobility of a family by the number of horses which it kept for the Olympic games. 475.

4. *Κνίσσα*, *Κρίσσα*, *Κρίσσαῖος*, *κονίσσαλος*, not *κνίσσα*, &c. is the proper orthography. It may be observed in general, that transcribers doubled the sigma, wherever it was possible without offending against quantity; as in *Πάρνασος*, *Κασάνδρα*, &c. See Gloss. 53. 505.

5. *Αὐτὸς πρὸς αὐτοῦ*, not *πρὸς αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ*. 787.

6. The Attic writers preserved the terminations of numbers in composition. Thus they said, *πεντηκοντάκαις*, *πεντέμηνος*, &c. 878.

7. The ancients when they quoted a proverb, the author of which was unknown, used to say, *κατὰ τοὺς σοφοὺς*, or *ὡς λέγουσιν οἱ σοφοί*. 913.

8. In the active voice, *μέλειν* signifies *curæ esse*, to be an object of care; in the middle voice only *μέλεσθαι* denotes *curare*, to take care. Gloss. 3.

9. *Στέργω*, *æquo animo fero*, to bear patiently, [or rather to be content with, to submit to]; in which sense *ἀγαπάω* is also used. *Στέργω* sometimes, though seldom, governs a dative case. Gloss. 11.

10. *Πάγος*, a hill; from the old word *πάγω*, *pango*, to build; because in the first ages men were accustomed to build their huts on the more elevated situations: whence, more anciently, *πάγος* was the same as the Latin *pagus*; the first syllable of which is long, being derived from the Æolic *πάγω*, sc. *πήγω*: the first of *πάγος* is now short, because the more recent Greeks formed it after their usual manner from the 2nd aorist of *πήγνυμι*. Gloss. 20.

11. The last syllable of *πέρα* is always long. Gloss. 30.

12. *Διατόρος*, or *Διάτορος*, perforating or perforated, according

as it is paroxyton, or propäroxyton; it is used in both senses. Gloss. 76.

13. *Κύκλος*, a circle, an orb, is sometimes put simply for the sun. Philoct. 815. Gloss. 91.

14. *Μυρία* signifies πολλά, and is a metaphor taken from fluids; from *μύρω*, to flow. Gloss. 94.

15. *Ταγὼς* is one who arranges; a military word, from *τάσσω*. The first syllable is always long; but of *ταγῇ* and its compounds short. Gloss. 96.

16. *Ὀδμή*, the ancient Attic form for *ὁσμή*. Photius and Thomas Magister call it Ionic; which is also true, for the Ionic and ancient Attic dialect were the same. Gloss. 115.

17. *Ἐκπλήσσω*, to drive out, is followed by an accusative either of the person or the thing. Gloss. 136.

18. *Χαλάω*, to looseu, is properly said of ship ropes. Gloss. 183.

19. *Στορέω*, steruo, to spread, for which the Attics said *στόρνυμι*. Hence the Latin word *sterno*. Gloss. 198.

20. *ἄθθεν*, scilicet; this particle, generally joined with *ὥς* and a participle, adds somewhat of irony to the sentence in which it occurs. Sometimes it is found without *ὥς*, as Trach. 382. Gloss. 210.

21. Diminutives ending in *υλος* have something of blandishment in them, as *αἰμύλος* from *αἶμων*; *ἡδύλος* from *ἡδύς*; *μικκύλος* from *μίκκος*, or *μικρὸς*; *ἔρωτύλος* from *ἔρωες*, *ὀσμύλος*; *αἰσύλος*, *Αἰσχύλος*, *Χρεμύλος*. The form seems to be Æolic, because it is preserved in Latin; as in the diminutives, *parvulus*, *tremulus*, *globulus*, and especially *æmulus*, which is in fact nothing more than the Greek word *αἰμύλος*. All the words of this kind are paroxyton, and short in the penult. Gloss. 214.

22. Adverbs, of whatever form, are not derived from the genitive, as grammarians suppose, but from the dative case of nouns. The greater part of those deduced from the dative plural end in *ως* (sc. *οις*), some from the dative singular, in *ει* or *ι*. Those which were formed from nouns ending in *η* or *α*, were anciently written with *ει*, since they were nothing else than datives, so written before the invention of the letters *η* and *ω*. Thus from *βοῦ*, gen. *βοῦς*, dat. *βοεῖ*, arose *αὐτοβοεῖ*. But the dative of nouns ending in *ος* was formerly thus formed: *οἶκος*, dat. *οἶκοι*, *στρατὼς*, dat. *στρατοῖ*; therefore all adverbs derived from words of this kind anciently ended in *οι*; which is evident from the adverbs *οἶκοι*, *πεδοῖ*, *ἄρμοι*, *ἐνδοῖ*, which still retain the old termination. Afterwards the *ο* was omitted, lest the adverb should be confounded with the nominative plural. Thus from *ἄμαχος* is

formed ἀμαχί, not ἀμαχεί, from ἄνατος, ἀνατὶ, from ἀμάχτος, ἀμαχητὶ, from ἀστένακτος, ἀστενακτὶ, &c. The ancient form was frequently corrupted by transcribers, because they were not aware that the final ι is sometimes long and sometimes short: short, as ἀμογητὶ, *Iliad*. A. 636. μεγαλωστὶ, Σ. 26. μελείσσι, Ω. 409. ἀστενακτὶ, *Æschyl.* ap. *Athen.* vii. p. 303. C. ἄωρι, *Aristoph.* *Eccles.* 737. *Theocrit.* x. 40. xxiv. 38: long, as ἀνιδρωτὶ, *Iliad*. O. 226. ἀσπουδι, O. 476. ἀναιματὶ, P. 363. ἀνουτητὶ, X. 371. μεταστοιχί, Ψ. 358. ἐγκυτὶ, *Archilochus*, *Etym. M.* p. 311. 40. (yet the last syllable of the same word is made short by *Callimachus*. *Suid.* v. ἐνχρῶ,) ἀστακτὶ, Ω. C. 1646. ἀκρονυχί, *Meleager Brunck.* *Anal.* i. p. 10. ἀκλαυτὶ, *Callim.* fr. ccccxviii. Gentile adverbs ending in τι, as Δωριστὶ, Φρυγιστὶ, &c., have the last syllable always short. *Gloss.* 216.

23. Adjectives ending in υς when compounded with another word, change the υς into ης, as μελαμβιβῆς, πτερυγικῆς, κυνοθαγσῆς, &c. *Gloss.* 227.

24. Ἀνταμείβομαι, to requite, takes either a dative or a genitive case. *Gloss.* 231.

25. Νηλεῶς is formed from ἀνηλεῶς by aphæresis, not from the privative particle νη, which is not a Greek word. So there is νῆστες and ἀνηστis; νήγρετος and ἀνήγρετος; νήνεμος and ἀνήνεμος; νηκουστέω and ἀνηκουστέω; νηκεστον and ἀνήκεστον. Νηλεγῆς is used for ἀναλεγῆς, νηπενθῆς for ἀναπενθῆς, νημερτῆς for ἀναμερτῆς, (*Hesych.*) by eliding α, and changing α into η Ionic. Ἀνάλιπος occurs *Theocr.* vi. 36. for which there is νήλιπος, *Apoll. Rh.* iii. 646. *Gloss.* 248.

26. Θᾶκος is the form used by the Attic poets: θῶκος seems to be Ionic. *Gloss.* 288.

27. Μετὰ in composition signifies change or alteration. *Gloss.* 317.

28. Ζηλῶ σε, invidendum te puto; I think you enviable. This is a form of speaking which congratulates with some admiration. Μαχαρίζω is frequently, ὀλβίζω but seldom, used in this sense. See *Walcken.* *Theocr.* *Adoniz.* p. 415. *Gloss.* 338.

29. Παρὰ in composition very frequently conveys the idea of weakness or uselessness; as παρήγορος and παράτανος, *Alcest.* 400. *Gloss.* 371.

30. Ἄϊς, orcus, the same as Ἄϊδης, but with the soft breathing; the Attics said ἄϊς, but Ἄϊδης, οἰστὸς, αἰσσω, &c. *Gloss.* 442.

31. Φύρω, commisceo, to mingle; the more recent form is φυράω, which occurs *Theb.* 48. *Gloss.* 459.

32. Τραε, verum somnium, a true dream; *Hom.* *Od.* T.



547. Οὐκ ὄναρ, ἀλλ' ὕπαρ ἐσθλόν, ὃ καὶ τετελεσμένον ἔσται. Gloss. 495.

33. The first syllable of *λπαρέω* is long, because it is formed from *λπαρής*. Gloss. 529.

34. Ἀπύω, pronuncio, to utter, has the penult common. It is short, P. V. 613. Theb. 143. Pers. 123. Equit. 1023. It is long, Hec. 156. and Eur. Suppl. 800. Gloss. 613.

35. Words compounded with *πλήσσω*, as *εἰστροπλήξ*, are all oxyton, except *ὑσπλήξ*. Gloss. 702.

36. *Χρίμπτω*, propinquo, to approach. The most ancient mode of writing this word was *Χρίπτω*; in which *μ* was afterwards inserted for the sake of euphony. Gloss. 738.

37. *Συλάω*, spolio, to plunder, requires an accusative of the person, and an accusative or genitive (but more frequently an accusative) of the thing. Gloss. 786.

38. *Χάριν δέσθαι, τίθεσθαι*, and even *θεῖναι*, signifies to confer a favor. Gloss. 807.

39. Ἀπυρος, ardentissimus. In some words *α* is intensive, and is said by grammarians *ἐπίτασιν δηλοῦν*: so *ἀδάκρυτος* for *πολυδάκρυτος*, in Soph. Trachin. 106. Antig. 881. *ἄξύλω ὕλη*, Homer, Il. 4. 135. *ἄπυρος*, in the sense of *sine igne*, is used, Agam. 71. Gloss. 905.

#### PERSÆ.

1. The Tragic writers made the first syllable of *ἴσος* short; but in *ἰσότης* they necessarily lengthened the iota, in order that the word might be adapted to verse. The same thing took place in *ἀθάνατος, ἀκάματος, ἀπαράμυθος*. They said *θηφόρος, ἀσπιδηφόρος, ἐλαφρηβόλος*, and the like: rather *θεοφόρος, ἀσπίδοφόρος, ἐλαφοβόλος*, for the same reason, viz. that the concurrence of four or more short syllables might be avoided. (81.)

2. *Κυάνειον*, according to Burney, is a trisyllable: but since *κύανον* is the name of a metal, *κυάνειον* is more correctly written *κιανούον*. Phrynichus, *Χρῆ οὖν λέγειν χρυσᾶ, ἄργυρᾶ, κυανᾶ, τὸν Ἀττικίζοντα*.—*Χρυσούς λέγε' τὸ γὰρ χρυσίος Ἰακὼν, ὡσαύτως καὶ ἄργυροῦς, χαλκοῦς, κυανοῦς, καὶ ὁμοία*. The first syllable of *κυάνειος* is always long in Homer; as also in Soph. Antig. 966. Eurip. Androm. 856. 1003. Tróas, 1094. (83.)

3. An inhabitant of Syria was called *Σύρος*; an inhabitant of the island of Syros (one of the Cyclades), *Σύριος*. (86.)

4. It is uncertain whether the Tragic writers used the present imperative of *γίγνομαι*. (176.)

5. As often as *πολύς* is joined with an epithet, the particle

καὶ intervenes, though it adds nothing to the sense. This remark is true of all the Greek writers. (249.)

6. The more ancient Attic forms were κέλυσμα, γνωστὸς, κλαυστὸς, ἡμίκαυστος, καταχύσματα, κρούσμα; in the more modern, the sigma was dropped. (403.)

7. Δίψα, ης, is the more ancient, δίψος, εος, the more modern form. (490.)

8. The first syllable of ἄλω is short, Pers. 639. Agam. 55. Cæ. C. 1767. Hec. 178.; and long, Eumen. 841. Cæ. C. 804. Hec. 174. Vesp. 516. (639.)

9. The imperfect of ἀπόλλυμι is but seldom used by the Tragic writers: Soph. Electr. 1360. ἀλλ' ἐμὲ Λόγοις ἀπώλλυς. Cæ. R. 1454. Ἰν' ἐξ ἐκείνων, οἳ μ' ἀπολλύτην, θάνω. (658.)

10. From φάω is formed πιφάσκω, as from δάω διδάσκω, from βάω, βιβάσκω, which should be replaced in Homer for the anomalous word βιβάσθω. But the Æolic form πιφαύσκω is more frequently found in Homer. (668.)

11. Ἰθύνω, not εὐθύνω, is the more ancient Homeric and poetic word; for the Attics used εὐθύνω, εὐθυνος, εὐθύνη, &c. only in political affairs: that ἰθὺς was the ancient Attic word is proved by the compounds ἰθυτενής, ἰθύφαλλος, ἰθαγενής. (779.)

12. The Greeks said Σαλαμινίδες and Σαλαμινιάδες, not Σαλαμινίδες; as also λειμωνίδες and λειμωνιάδες; κρηνίδες and κρηνιάδες. (956.)

13. Ἀφνειός, opulentus, wealthy: the more common form is ἀφνειός. Gloss. 3.

14. Πεδοστιβής, terra incedens, walking on the ground. This word frequently occurs in Euripides. Compounds in στιβής sometimes have a passive signification; as ἡλιοστιβής, P. V. 816. ἀστὶβής, Theb. 857. Gloss. 132.

15. Ἐν ὑμῖν, penes te sunt, depend on you. The same meaning obtains, Cæ. R. 914. Ἐν σοὶ γὰρ ἴσμεν. See also Aj. Fl. 519. Phœniss. 1265. Iph. A. 1379. Helen. 1441. Gloss. 177.

16. Λέπαδνον, averta; Anglice, a poitrel or breast-band, which performed the office of the collar with us. The word is formed from λεπάω, decortico, to strip off the bark. Phœtius makes λέπαδνον and μασχαλιστήρ the same. Gloss. 196.

17. Σφαδάζω, luctor, to struggle; properly said of those who are in the agonies of death. Gloss. 198.

18. Φαῦλος and φλαῦρος are used in the same sense; but φαῦλος is more frequently applied to persons, and φλαῦρος to things. Their derivations are different. That is properly called φλαῦρον which is light, and of no weight. From its

parent word φλέω, are derived φλέψ, φλέος, φλέδων, φλάω, φλέγω, φλύαξ, φλοιός, φλοῖστος, φλύω, φλυαρός, φλαῦρος; all of which have a notion of lightness and emptiness. Gloss. 222.

19. Ἀμᾶν is, to scrape with the hand, sc. the sand, and to make level, from ἄμα: hence ἀμαυρόν is, whatever is levelled with the ground. Of the same family are ἀμαθος, arena, the sand; and ἀμαθύνω, to erase, as letters written on the sand: likewise ἀμαλόν, plane, and ἀμαλδύνω, to render plane; and all of them perhaps ought to be aspirated. Gloss. 228.

20. The ancients only used the plural form δυσμαί, occasus, the setting, sc. of the sun, or the West. On the contrary, δύσις was always put in the singular. Gloss. 237.

21. The particle ζα is nothing else but the Æolic form of διά, which has an intensive force, like per in Latin. Thus Alcæus said ζάδηλον for διάδηλον: Sappho, ζαλεκσάμαν for διελεξάμην. Therefore we find ζάθεος, ζαμενής, ζάπλουτος, ζαπότης, ζατρεφής, ζαφεγγής, ζάχρυσος, ζαχρήος. Gloss. 321.

22. Ἔως, in the sense of donec, until, requires the aorist [indicative]. Sometimes, but seldom, it is followed by the aorist optative. But when it signifies dum, quamdiu, whilst, as long as, it requires the present or imperfect. Gloss. 432.

23. Νομίζειν, signifies to believe in the existence of. He who believed in the gods was said absolutely θεός νομίζειν, or ἡγεῖσθαι. Gloss. 504.

24. Πίμπρημι. Incendo, to burn. Perhaps the first μ was inserted by the later Greeks; and the ancients wrote πίπρημι and πίπλημι, according to the usual form of verbs in μι. Ἐμπίπρημι occurs in Aristot. Hist. Anim. v. 1. as also frequently in Herodotus,—ἐμπίπλημι, Homer, Il. Φ. 311. Nor is the quantity of the syllable any objection. See Erfurdt, Soph. Œ. R. p. 414. Gloss. 815.

25. In the Tragic writers the plural of ἐπιτίμιον is used, not the singular. Gloss. 828.

26. From the ancient word πνώω, the first syllable of which is long (and its perf. pass. frequently occurs in Homer), is formed πινύσκω, in the same way that γινώσκω is formed from γνάω. Gloss. 835.

27. Ἀνέχομαι, sustinere, to bear or endure, is joined with a participle. See Dr. Monk's Hipp. 354. Gloss. 849.

# OXFORD PRIZE POEM.

## CARMEN SECULARE.

**F**ELICES Britonum curas, atque addita vitæ  
 Commoda, et inventas artes, bellicque triumphos  
 Expediam ; vos, Angliacæ clarissima gentis  
 Lumina, queis mundi rerumque arcana retextit  
 Ipsa volens natura ; et vos, qui, Martiâ passi  
 Vulnera, pro patria justis cecidistis in armis,  
 Magnanimi Heroës ! vestras date floribus urnas  
 Spargere, nec nostræ conamina temnite, Musæ.  
 Sit mihi fas audita loqui, sit facta referre,  
 Tardaque bis denis volventia tempora lustris  
 Respicere, humanæ licet æquora turbida vitæ  
 Musa gemat circumspectans, secumque revolvat,  
 Mœsta, hominum scelera, et parvo sub pectore fluctus  
 Irarum ingentes, et corda oblita futuri.  
 Inde graves nasci luctus, et bella per orbem,  
 Et diræ passim cædes, et mille doloris,  
 Mille mali facies ; fuso Discordia crine  
 Funeream accendens tædam, insatiata cruore  
 Vindicta, et desolatas bacchata per urbes  
 Ambitio, et culpæ merito comes addita Pœna.

Nam Pater omnipotens ignotis legibus orbem  
 Temperat, et densa noctis velatus amictu  
 Sceptra tenet ;—nobis, credo, neque machina rerum  
 Tota patet, certive arcana volumina fati.

Haud tamen, haud nostrum est, rerum alte exquirere causas,  
 Tantum adeo aversamur opus ; magis acta referre  
 Et patriam aggredimur laudem ; vocat altior armis,  
 Altior ingenio Brittannia, sæcla parentum  
 Exsuperans fama, et majoribus inclyta cœptis.

Depictas alii voces, Cadmeia signa  
 Et Batavum curas, calami quæ tædia primum  
 Et scriptæ docuere moras odisse tabellæ.

Mirandæ ductas alii magnete carinas,  
 Nitratosque ignes celebrent, imitataque divum  
 Fulmina, vim quorum contra nihil ipsa valeret,  
 Lorica Æacidæ, aut clypei septēmplicis orbes.

At cœli docuisse vias ; quo concita motu  
 Sidera agant certa nocturnas lege choreas ;

Qui cursus anni ; quo sol moderamine flectat  
 Errantes stellas, medii ad prætoria mundi  
 Regius ipse sedens ; coëundi quanta cupido  
 Ordine quæque suo teneat ; quo turbidus æstu  
 Invadat terram fluctus, fugiatque vicissim,  
 Luna, tuum comitatus iter ; quæ splendida lucis  
 Materies ; septemque Iris trahat unde colores ;  
 Laus erit hæc saltem, nostroque hæc gloria sæclo.

Quanquam etenim haud nostris illuxit prima diebus  
 Vis animi, Newton, tui, et felicior ætas  
 Ingenii, eximios jactet nascentis honores ;  
 Sed vidisse tamen, sed et audivisse docentem  
 Te, decus o Patriæ, naturæ magne sacerdos,  
 Contigit huic sæclo, et circum flevisse sepulcrum !

Nec verò, interea, nobis non utilis unda  
 Suppositis flammis, modicoque expansa calore,  
 Mirum adeo tulit auxilium ; stat turris ad auras  
 Sulphurea nebula, et fumosis cincta tenebris,  
 Pendet abhinc, vastamque extrudit in aëra molem  
 Ferratis trabibus, centumque innexa catenis  
 Machina ; quin subtus calefactæ sævit aquæ vis  
 Alta petens, gelidam tecti de culmine lympham  
 Quæ simul accepit gremio, condensa residit,  
 Desertumque super spatium, et vacua atria linquit :  
 Nec mora, præcipiti tendens in inania lapsu  
 Irruit, et portam obstantem circumfluus æther  
 Deprimit ; hinc motu alterno surgitque caditque  
 Libra ingens, molesque graves, congestaque tollit  
 Pondera : non alio humentis penetrabilia terræ  
 Auxilio ingredimur, qua divitis ima metalli  
 Vena latet ; tali domitum molimine ferrum  
 In varias cogit formas, fingitque premendo  
 Malleus ; at veniet tempus cum viribus illis  
 Adverso tardas urgebit flumine cymbas  
 Navita, et obstantes vincet sine remige fluctus.

Sed neque nos ignota latent tuâ tenuia regna,  
 Aura levis ; quantos ibi nostri mira triumphos  
 Vis tulit ingenii ! lustratam naribus æthram,  
 Littoribus longe patriis terraque relicta,  
 Vidimus, et vasti superantes mœnia mundi  
 Icarias homines ausos coptemnere pœnas.

Quin et scire datur, quo crebris ignibus æther  
 Innocuum micet, ardentem quo fulminis alam  
 Ducat docta manus, certoque in tramite flammam

Dirigat; agnosco hæc nostris concessa diebus  
 Arcana, et proavis longos ignota per annos.  
 Nonne vides? nimborum inter cœlique tumultus  
 Præscripto celeres concurrunt ordine flammæ,  
 Porrigit excelsum qua ferrea virga tridentem,  
 Servatrix; tutis assurgunt templa columnis  
 Interea, regumque domus, atque aurea tecta.

Hinc etiam variis aptat medicamina morbis  
 Naturæ expertus sapiens, renovatque trementum  
 Corpora fracta senum, et tristi languentia nocte  
 Lumina. Jam, vitreo circumvolvente cylindro,  
 Igneus exsiluit vigor, et penetrabilis artus  
 Percurrit calor, et venis se immiscuit imis.

Quid referam servata undis, ereptaque letho  
 Corpora, dum sævis Acherontis faucibus hæret  
 Eluctans anima, et vultus et livida circum  
 Tempora dirigit concreto flumine sanguis.

Atque ea dum in patrio molimina tanta movemus,  
 Rite solo, interea haud segnes aliena per arva  
 Assequimur famam, meritosque augemus honores.

Vos fortunati, primum quibus ausa carina  
 Spernere cæruleos fines, et limina rerum  
 Antiqua, et magno nova quærere littora ponto,  
 Talibus incoëptis olim tua flumina, Amazon,  
 Inventique Cubæ scopuli, Gyanæque paludes,  
 Visaque thuriferis pulcherrima Florida pratis.

Non tamen Hesperius ductor, nou classis Ibera,  
 Non quos armipotens emisit Lisboa nautas,  
 Laudibus Angliaci certent dâcis; ille sonantes  
 Annyanis scopulos inter, glaciataque ponti  
 Claustra tenebat iter; non illum terruit Arctos  
 Parrhæsis, atque suis Boreas sævissimus oris.  
 Nec minus immites tractus, et littora vidit  
 Australi vicina polo, qua frigida pandit  
 Saxosos Maloina sinus, atque altera nostris  
 Subjecta imperiis, terrarumque ultima Thule.

Illum auri non dira fames, non impia duxit  
 Ambitio, aut sævæ fallax pietatis imago;  
 Sed patriæ divinus amor, sed vivida virtus  
 Impulit, et meritæ laudis generosa cupido.  
 Nec lustrare vias tantum, tractusque latentes  
 - Æquoris, audaces jussit Britannia puppes;  
 Scilicet, oceani imperium, invictumque tridentem  
 Classe virisque potens, tenet, æternumque tenebit  
 Illa, maris Regina; en, Plata sonantibus undis,

Ultimus, en, Daonas, et sulva Tigris arena  
Fundit opes varias, prædæque assueta Malaya  
Submisso nostras veneratur acinace leges.

Quid tantum memorem imperium, quid subdita regna  
Æthiopum, primoque rubentia littora sole,  
Et quibus occiduo curru jam lenior oris  
Illuxit fessæ tandem vis sera diei.

Nobis, quos rapido scindit Laurentius amne,  
Felices parent campi; et quæ plurima Ganges  
Regna lavat; positis armis exterrita pacem  
Birma petit, gens dura virum petiere Marattæ.  
Quid Javæ referam sylvas, quid saxa Mysoræ,  
Quæque nimis tepido consurgit proxima soli  
Taprobanæ, lætasque tuas, Caffraria, vites?  
Tuque etiam, immeritis Gallorum erepta catenis,  
Anglorum læto fluitantia signa triumpho  
Vidisti tandem, Melite! tuque, inclyta Calpe,  
Firma manes, nostris dudum decorata tropæis;  
Quæ rupe Herculeæ, quæ milite tuta Britanno,  
Hispanumque minas et inania despicias arma!  
Interea, quæcunque viam tenuere per undas,  
Sæva licet nostro minitetur Gallia regno,  
Et conjuratis Europæ ferveat armis,  
Submittunt humiles nobis vexilla carinæ.

Nec tamen has tantum meruit Britannia laudes,  
Magna armis—major pietate—hinc ille remotos  
(Ille decus nostrum et meritæ pars optima famæ)  
Lustravit populos, et dissita regna tyrannum,  
Panderet ut mœstas arces invisaque Phœbæ  
Limina, qua nigris late sonuere cavernis  
Assidui gemitus et iniqui pondera ferri.

Hinc etiam Libyco consurgunt littore turres,  
Et nostræ incultis monstrantur gentibus artes  
Hesperidum scopulos extra, et deserta Sahara  
Fœda situ: nec longa dies, cum servus iniqua  
Vincula rumpet ovans, et pictas Gambia puppes  
Et nova arenosis miretur mœnia ripis.

O patria, o primum felix! seu pace volentes  
Alma regas populos, et justa lege feroces  
Arbitra compescas; seu belli tela corusces  
Fulminea metuenda manu,—tu maxima ponto,  
Tu circumfûsis victrix dominaberis undis.

Cincta etenim patria frondentia tempora quercu  
Se comitem adjunxit, nostroque in littore sedem  
Aurea libertas posuit; non illa furentes

Sueta animos, cæcique incendero pectora vulgi;  
Qualis Sarmaticis olim regnavit in arvis,  
Effera,—sanguinea,—aut qualem nunc Gallia plorat  
Maternis sparsam lacrymis et clade suorum;  
At regnis, Alurede, tuis quæ candida primum  
Effulsit, cæli soboles, quæ sæva Britannûm  
Frænavit corda, et torvis metuenda tyrannis  
Jura dedit:—longos illinc deducta per annos  
Imperia, et trino concordia fœdere regna.

Marlburios testor cineres, effusaque Galli  
Agmina, cum luctu pallens Lodoicus et ira,  
Undique disjectas acies, fœdataque flevit  
Lilia, vix demum media securus in urbe,  
Quid libertatis potuit divinitus ardens  
Flamma, quid iuvicti, testor, potuere Britanni!

Nec jam magnorum proles oblita parentum  
Nascimur: haud adeo divinus pectoris ardor,  
Martiaque edormit virtus: tua flumina, Nile,  
Testor, quasque Tagus dives devolvit arenas!  
Scilicet et fractas vidisti, Texela, classes,  
Et spes abruptas, atque irrita tela tuorum!  
Quid referam claras victrici classe calendas  
Qua viridem Armoricen inter, Dumaganiaque arva  
Hesperio resonant Uxantia littora fluctu?

Cum spreto malesana Deo, totumque per orbem  
Gallia, cæca, furens, cunctas sibi subdere gentes  
Sperabat, solioque sacros detrudere reges,  
Reppulit ipsa suo venientem littore pestem  
Anglia, et his saltem vetuit consistere terris.  
Ergo iuxta medias Europæ illæsa ruinas  
Constitit, haud rerum, tantis labefacta procellis,  
Devictas inter gentes, et diruta late  
Imperia; has coluit Pietas conterrita sedes,  
Has antiqua Fides, atque o, ni tristia fati  
Jura vetent, orbis primum cohibere tyrannos  
Nostrum erit, eversoque iterum succurrere sæclo.

HEBER,

1801.

COLL. ÆN. NAS.



## RIDDLES OF PROFESSOR PORSON.

[From "*The Crypt*."]

---

I.

CORPORE parva licet, sum turribus altior : uno  
 Staus pede, perpetui turbinis instar agor.  
 Uno immota loco, soleo tanien usque moveri,  
 In sola constans mobilitate feror.  
 Consilii expertem me nauta sagaxque viator  
 Consulat,—haud fallax temporis augur cro.  
 Si sapias, nostri similes fuge cautus amicos,  
 Fortunamque parem, par levitate caput.

II.

Vina bibo, quoties larga est mihi copia lymphæ ;  
 Lympha mihi desit, nil bibo præter aquam.

III.

Non metuit mea frons æstum, neque frigus ; ad idem  
 Usque comæ color est, perpetuusque decor.  
 Ut decro Phœbi, decoro sic Martis alumnos ;  
 Sanguine me Mavors, carmine Phœbus alit.  
 Sæpe ut pascat heros, et lautas condiat escas,  
 Me crudelis aqua vexat et igne coquus.  
 Si, quibus involvar tenebris, evolvere possis,  
 Particulam poteris, Lector, habere mei.

IV.

Nil video, quamvis oculos mihi semper apertos  
 Ars dederit ; patet os, nec licet ore loqui.  
 Vin' loquar et videam ? duce te, res utraque fiet ;  
 Ora oculosque meis jungo,—videbo, loquar.  
 Dat varios diversa mihi pictura colores,  
 Nunc ego deformis, nunc ego pulchra vocor.  
 In scena dominor, regnoque per orgia ; sub me  
 Impietas, error, fraus, amor, ira latent.  
 Me nunquam pietas, me nunquam candor amavit,  
 Candoremque pium fingere docta scio.  
 Mille arcana tego, tibi velo ænigmata mille,  
 Cœdipe ; fac, ne te, neu tua sensa, tegam.

V.

Sum calamo similis, fragili sum corpore ; venter  
 Sæpius, ut fornax aut focus, igne calet.  
 Me miles, me nauta cupit, me bajulus optat,  
 Deliciæque solent me vocitare suas.  
 Nobilibus sapio paucis ; bene multa vaporem  
 Ora bibunt, sorbeunt guttura nulla meum.  
 Suppleo colloquium, curas ac tædia pello,  
 Purgo caput, cerebri nubila nube fugo.  
 Alba senescendo mihi fit coma, sed mihi corpus,  
 CEdipe, fit, senio dedecorante, nigrum.  
 Dum sensum tenues meus evanescit in auras  
 Halitus, est vitæ vera figura meæ.

VI.

Te *Primum* incauto nimium propiusque tuenti,  
 Laura, mihi furtim surripuisse queror.  
 Nec tamen hoc furtum tibi condonare recusem,  
 Si simili pretium solvere merce velis.  
 Sed quo plus candoris habent tibi colla *Secundo*,  
 Hoc tibi plus *Primum* frigoris intus habet.  
 Jamque sinistra cava prædixit ab ilice *Totum*,  
 Omine et audaces spes vetat esse ratas.

ابن خلدون

*On the prevalence of the Arabic language in Asia and in Africa, or in the countries formerly conquered by the Arabs, and on the various languages in use amongst the inhabitants of great cities in the territories of Muselmén ; extracted and translated from the work [ابن خلدون] of EBN KHALEDUNE, being the twenty-second chapter of the fourth book of the Critical and Historical Work, entitled, Kateb el eber wa dewan el moubteda wel khabaer, &c.*

It should be observed that the prevailing idiom amongst the inhabitants of great cities that have been conquered by the Arabs, is no other than that of the nation which has subjected them, and of the people that have conquered them.

It is for this reason, that, even in our days, the Arabi language is spoken in all the capital cities in Muselman countries, in the east as well as in the west, although, in truth, the ancient language of *Modhar* (i. e. of the Koran), which was formerly in use, is now corrupted, and its inflections changed.

We must attribute the prevalence of this language to the victories of the Muselman over the foreign nations: in fact the social existence of a people and their government being found to be united with their religion, these institutions are, as far as regards religion, the basis upon which it exerts its influence; and herein the form surpasses the foundation.

Now Islamism could not be studied otherwise than with the assistance of the knowledge of the divine law, that is to say, the law of the Koran; which book was written in Arabic, because it was the maternal language of the Prophet (Muhammed, i. e. Mahomet); this circumstance necessarily swept away or caused to be disused all the other languages of the various kingdoms wherein they had been before used.

It is in this point of view that we should consider the prohibition set up by the *Khalep Omar* to those of his subjects who were not Arabians, prohibiting them the use of foreign languages, as that use (he observed) would be an act not only of malevolence but of apostacy.

It was religion therefore that rejected the use of these foreign idioms; and as the Arabic was the language of the chiefs of the Muselman domination, all the other languages in the various kingdoms where they were current, were disused, whilst the subjects of the conquered nations conformed with the example of their new sovereigns, and adopted their worship; accordingly, the use of the language of the Arabs became one of the tokens of Islamism, as well as of the domination of that people; the conquered people universally renounced their particular idioms for the substitution of that of the Arabs; thus it was that this language became established, and was the prevailing language in all capital cities and principal towns where 'all other languages not Arabic became strange and disused; But the intermixture of these various languages and nations in the course of time corrupted to a certain extent the Arabic language, inasmuch as its terminations were thus altered, but the root remained: it is this modified dialect which is known in all the great capitals of the Muselman countries, by

---

<sup>1</sup> The word *clajem* [الجميع], in the Arabic original] implies all foreign languages, or all languages not Arabic.

the term <sup>1</sup> *town language*. In fact, at this day, the population of these great towns is composed (for the most part) of the posterity of those Arabs who conquered them, and who afterwards came to settle among them, and afterwards died in their luxury, as well as of the posterity of the *non-Arabs*<sup>2</sup> who previously inhabited them, and who possessed their houses and lands by right of inheritance. As the idioms were perpetuated from generation to generation by oral transmission, the language of the fathers was preserved among their descendants, although it was gradually changed in its forms by the intermixture of <sup>3</sup>foreign languages with the Arabic. The dialect thus composed (as before observed) is called *town language*, because it is the language spoken by the inhabitants of the towns, to distinguish it from the Arabic of the Bedoween, which is unmixed and more pure, and is denominated the language of the Desert. With such a mixture as this the Arabic could not fail to be corrupted; nay, it was even at the point of being altogether lost, at that period when there reigned at the extremity of the east the Persian Princes of Deelam, and subsequently the Selgicide Turks, and on the other extremity, in the west, (that is to say in Barbary,) the race of the <sup>4</sup> Zenâta and that of the Berbers; for these sovereigns of foreign extraction governed in all the Muselman kingdoms. Nevertheless the attachment of the Muselman to the Koran and to the Sunna, in which are deposited, in Arabic, every thing that relates to the Muselman religion, was thus the cause of the preservation of their language, insomuch that it continued to prevail in the towns, as *town language*.

It was however quite otherwise when the Tartars and the Monguls governed in the east, for these people were not Muselman; and this circumstance effaced, at that period of time, the preponderance of the Arabic language, which then became altogether so corrupted as to leave no longer any traces of it in

<sup>1</sup> حضرًا *al-hazra* in the original may be rendered (besides its being the language of the cities and great towns) contemporary, or conversational, or modern dialect.

<sup>2</sup> العجم *El agem*, in the original Ms.

<sup>3</sup> العجم *in the original Ms.*; q. d. foreign, unintelligible, barbarous.

<sup>4</sup> It is زنانة *Zenana*, in the printed copy from the original; which is incontestably a mistake in the punctuation, as tho. [زناتة] *Zenâta*, a celebrated race in the west, is here designated.

the Muselman kingdoms of <sup>1</sup> Irak-ajemy, of Khorasan, of Persia, of India, and of Mowarannahr, (that is to say Transoxiana.) Nor do any remains of this language appear in the Northern countries of Asia, nor in Roum, (that is to say in Asia Minor,) where they no longer conform to the distinctive peculiarities of the Arabic language in the composition of verse and prose. This idiom is accordingly no longer cultivated in those countries, but by such as seek to study fundamentally the Arabian sciences.

Thus the use of the Arabic language has continued solely amongst those Muselman to whom the most high God had vouchsafed that favor; and thus it has remained the town language in Egypt, in Syria,<sup>2</sup> in Spain,<sup>3</sup> and in Barbary,<sup>4</sup> because the Muhamedan religion has perpetuated its use in those countries, where also the inhabitants have shown themselves zealous for its perpetuation, so that its prevalence has maintained itself.

It is not so with regard to the language of *Irak-ajemy*, and of the other more remote countries spoken of above, where there remains no longer any vestige of the Arabic; insomuch that, even the books relative to sciences are written in the vulgar languages of those respective countries, and these various languages are there made use of *even in their literary assemblies*. Finally, God disposes as he pleases of night and day, (that is to say, of every thing).

<sup>1</sup> Persian Irak.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Une Dissertation sur la Conformité de *l'Arabe de Barbarie* avec *l'Arabe de Syrie* par J. Grey Jackson, Paris, 1824. chez Dondey Dupré. Vide also le Journal Asiatique, vol. 4. page 193—200. 291. and vol. 5. p. 125—128.

<sup>3</sup> When Ebn Khalidune wrote, the Arabs governed in Spain.

<sup>4</sup> Much light is likely to be thrown on the valuable work of Ebn Khalidune (denominated by the French the Montesquieu of the Arabs) by M. Schultz, who is on a literary journey in the east, and has already discovered in one of the libraries in Constantinople the celebrated work of Ebn Khalidune, in 7 large volumes.

## OXFORD LATIN PRIZE ESSAY, FOR 1828.

*Unde evenit, ut in liberalium artium studiis præstantissimus  
quisque apud singulas gentes eodem fere sæculo floruerit?*

In the youth of a state arms do flourish ; in the middle age of a state, learning ; and then both of them together for a time ; in the declining age of a state, mechanical arts and merchandize.—*Bacon's Essay on Vicissitude of Things.*

ARGUMENTUM.—Cum fere paria sint in singulis sæculis hominum ingenia, causæ, quas quarimus, petendæ ex rerum ordine ac natura. Spectata Græcia, negatur aliquid inesse in pacis otio et tranquillitate, quod optimarum artium studia sua vi, nullis aliis causis adhibitis, excitare, nedum ad maturitatem perducere possit. Quamobrem causæ altius repetantur ; et ratione habita societatis humanæ, 1. unde ortum ; 2. unde incrementa capiat ; 3. quibus demum modis ad summa sua fastigia sensim perducatur ; ostenditur, in eadem temporum spatia necessario convenire summam fere unius cujusque populi potestatem et optimarum artium perfectionem. Accedunt etiam pro variis singuli cujusque populi fortunis secundæ quædam et concurrentes causæ.

Probatur autem sententia civitatum exemplis, quum veterum, tum recentiorum.

Si quid est in Historia exculi proprium et ornatu animi, si quid dulce, jucundum, et præ ceteris homine liberali dignum, si quid denique, quod lectorem continua scelerum et bellorum narratione fatigatum recreet, ad eas præsertim partes confugiendum est, ubi litterarum atque artium progressus in silentio et solitudine contemplari liceat, procul ab armorum strepitu et tubarum sono. Quod si quis tentare velit, et ingenii humani fata, ut ita dicam, fortunasque tentueri, statim occurret nobilis illa, et omni pertractatione digna quæstio, unde scilicet factum sit, celeberrima quæque in unaquaque optimarum artium provincia non nisi definitis quibusdam sæculis ingenia effloruisse. Quo magis admiror rem tantam a summis fere scriptoribus prætermisam ; præsertim cum ea sit, quam non sine aliquo negotio expediri posse pace omnium confirmaverim.

Nam si fere paria esse in singulis sæculis universorum hominum ingenia, neque decursu temporum deteriora facta in pejus ruere judicandum est ; sed una esse semper atque eadem, et in eo, quod tribuerit, natura, nihil unquam immutari ; si, ut verbo dicam, natura pares sumus, quantumvis disciplinæ provectiones, mirum profecto videri potest quod cæta quædam tempora uberiori præ reliquis ingeniorum copiam ediderint. Æstimanti autem facultates indolis humanæ, et earum etiam diversitatem

accuratius inspicienti, fere pares esse in omni sæculo nativas animorum vires, et justissima quadam trutina compensari, mihi certius videtur quam quod argumentis ad confirmandum egeat.

Verum hoc utcumque demum fuerit, non illud utique cujusvis esse ætatis dixerim, ut tales proferat, qualis fuit "divinus ille" Plato veterum memoria; qualis fuit Newtonus ille noster, qui neglectam diu et quasi situ deformatam veritatem tandem in avito<sup>1</sup> solio collocavit. Nihil enim sententiæ nostræ repugnabit, si maximos quosdam suis, ut ita dicam, temporibus addicemus: fuerit fortasse præclara vis ingeni illis divinitus concessa; aut cum ea esset, quæ, si incidisset in alia sæcula, nihil prorsus effecisset, consentientibus tamen causis feliciter excitata jus suum vindicaverit.

Quod si ex facultatum humanarum ratione nihil colligi potest, quare venerit, ut certa quædam ex tanto sæculorum ordine præ aliis effulserint, scientia illustrata, nobilitata artibus, ad rerum demceps naturam confugiendum est. Quam quidem intuitenti, nisi me suscepti operis amor vehementer fallit, nihil inipedit, quin hujusce rei causæ apertius et planius dignoscantur. Illa enim in se habet, quos quarimus, fontes et principia; et si ad hæc accedant etiam humani animi affectus, quibus nemo unquam caruit, isti tamen non pro principis, sed in subsidis et quasi admipiculis habendi. Quamquam enim laudis amor et cupido, atque alia animo innata, certo rerum ordine præeunte et quasi conspirante, plurimum momenti secum afferunt, sunt tamen per se infirmiora, quam quæ istos, quos jam contemplamur, effectus satis explicare possint.

Utilius autem videtur, priusquam ad causas pro facultate nostra explicandas accingamur, rem ipsam paullo attonius perpendere; et quibusdam ex iis sæculis, quæ tantum inclaruere paulisper adhibere annum; consensus eorum et similitudines excogitare, recensere differentias, et ita demum causas quas quærimus elicere conari. Itaque, quæ tempora memoriæ fuerint dignissima, leviter attingam; exorsus unde prima ceperint incrementa liberalium artium studia; istiusque infinitæ gloriæ, quam neque rerum vicissitudines, neque hominum oblivio delere possit, fundamenta jecerint.

Quod si ad fabulosam illam antiquitatem et Homericæ tempora recurramus, habemus sane, qui cum Homero intra ejusdem ætatis terminos conjungi possit, si Hesiodum excipias, plane

---

<sup>1</sup> Quam scilicet mundi descriptionem Pythagoras incerto quodam consilio leviter adumbrarat, firmissimis argumentis hic Noster stabilivit.

neminem. Neque illud admirandum : nam qui ea omnia superare possent, quæ tunc ingenio obstarent impedimenta, singulari quadam excellentia et pene divina præditos esse oportebat. Nihil igitur contra nos facit, si Homerum ætati suæ principem vel solum adjudicemus. Venerandus sane poeta quamplurimarum artium semina, si quis alius, in se habuit, et, ut ita dicam, litterarum sæculum vi propria effecit. Inerant nimirum in eo,

———— a quo, seu fonte perenni,  
Vatum Pieriis ora rigantur aquis,

fontes permultarum rerum, quorum infinita copia et dulcedine permoti mellita summi poetæ carmina posterī delibant.

Longo temporum intervallo, quum jam Civitates stabilius constitutæ, et magis implicitis inter se societatibus, cresceret indies mutua hominum consuetudo et commercium, ortus est Thales, philosophiæ princeps. Jam vero usque ad Alexandri tempora, annos plusquam ducentos, tot magnos, tot illustres viros in omni artium genere habemus, quot fortasse nulla alia sæcula intra locorum limites tam angustos unquam protulerint. Indoles scilicet humana diu, ut videtur, constricta et impedita, vires suas tandem mira quadam felicitate explicuit, et quasi luce sua exultavit : et quanto altius eminebat artium nobilitas, tanto etiam major poetarum, philosophorum, historicorum cohors. Adeo verum est, humanæ mentis facultates occasione semper pares inveniri, quæ quo diligentius excoluntur, voluntati nostræ eo libentius responsuræ sunt.

Hisce igitur temporibus tractandis aptissima videretur artium distinctio : quæ optima erit, et justissimis suis finibus definita, si singulas continuata serie breviter persequemur. Neque vero de his loquenti prætermittendus est mutuus ille liberalium artium nexus et necessitudo, unde tanquam ope mutua aliæ aliis adminiculo fiant et incremento. Quemadmodum enim pulcherrima et ad optimos usus aptissima est ea hominum societas, ubi quisque vires suas penitus perspexerit, et justa aliorum si poposcerit auxilia, ea sibi in promptu habeat ut utatur ; ita fortasse quam maxime erutescunt liberalium artium studia, si singula singulis invicem succurrere, aut si opus fuerit, etiam mederi possint. Quamobrem non est sola cæt atque unica quaestio, quæ quidem Paterculo in mentem venit, “ unde præstantissima cujusque professionis ingenia in eandem formam et in idem arotata temporis congruerint spatium ; ” verum illa quoque, vel nobilioris notæ, et honoris, pene infinita, “ unde singulis civitatibus certa quædam sæcula evererint omnium fere perfectione artium et litterarum insignita. ” Hæc autem una est



atque eadem investigatio; ita inter se colligatæ partes et implicitæ, ut si cogitatione atque animo, re tamen et veritate separari et certis distingui finibus non possint. Profluit enim ex iisdem causis, quæ singulo unicuique studio vim ac splendorem afferant, universarum artium gloria. Admotis ingenio stimulis, cum quasi ex improvise pene innumerabiles patefactæ sint ad honorem viæ, alii alia sequuntur, et quisque diversitati indolis suæ et ingenii morem gerit. Rarius igitur unum quemlibet egregium in suo genere solum vidimus; verum plures, quum ætate, tum studiis consociatos. Perraro autem una quædam ars, ignotis adhuc aliis, aut imperfectius elaboratis, sua vi, suis luminibus effulsit.

— alterius sic  
 Altera poscit opem res, et conjurat amice.

Et hæc quidem hactenus. De causis inferius disputandum: jam vero ad Græcos revertamur. Auctores philosophiæ agnoscimus, Thaletem et Pythagoram; illum Ionicorum, hunc vero Italicorum principem. Utriusque obscurior doctrina, neque ad veram utilitatem accommodata: ab illo enim in principiis rerum excogitandis et expendenda conformatione mundi tota posita est; hic vero, si ullam admisit morum disciplinam, fucatam tamen ineptiis et quasi laqueis irretitam veritatem impedit. Pythagoras suorum maximus: Thaletem, si non re, at eodem certe nomine, plures secuti sunt, quorum memoriam impensius veneramur. Socrates enim, discipulus Archelai, in Ionicorum ordinem a plerisque relatus est: injuria quidem, ut opinor, si præstantissimi Philosophi doctrinam intueri velis; qui inanes istas disputationes et putida arrogantis scientiæ commenta procul ablegavit, et integram philosophiæ reddidit simplicitatem. Plato proxime successit, qui quæcunque aut usui inservire aut sublimitati judicavit, conquisivit undique. Socraticos, quos unice amavit, mores pulcherrime depinxit. Multa ex libris Pythagoreis in suos transtulit. Ægyptiorum etiam arcana indagavit. Tanto denique magistro dignus Aristoteles utilitati nostræ singulari quodam beneficio consuluit, et morum exemplar, quod potuit, perfectum elaboravit.

Eadem est reliquarum artium et scientiarum gloria, et pari laude omnes celebrantur. Ex rudī quadam et solenni pompa scena nata est: orti sunt Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, alii-

---

<sup>1</sup> Οὐδὲ γὰρ περὶ τῆς τῶν πάντων φύσεως, ἥπερ οἱ πλείστοι τῶν ἄλλων, διελίγτο, σκοπούμενος ὥπως ὁ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν σοφιστῶν κόσμος ἔχει, καὶ τίσιν ἀνάγκαις ἵναστα γίγνεται τῶν αἰθανῶν ἄλλα καὶ τοὺς φροντίζοντας τὰ τοιαῦτα μωραίνοντας ἀπειδίκου. Memorabilia, i. 1, 11.

que complures, quorum quidem opera interempta annorum injuria ætas posteris invidit. Quin et ille in lucem prodit, jocosum et facetiarum princeps, et verus patriæ civis, qui, si bonos aliquando irridendos in scenam induxerit, nihil aliud voluit, nisi ut malos atque improbos eo facilius insectari posset. An insuper addam Herodotum, Thucydidem, et Xenophontem, maxima historicorum nomina: in suo quemque genere diversum, universos vero nulla non collaudatione dignos. Herodotum, amore et benevolentia colimus: qui primus cum Historia philosophiam consociavit, Thucydidem veneramus: Xenophonti damus litterarum elegantiam, accuratam scientiæ cognitionem, et veram animi benignitatem; quorum tamen ut laudator fiam, neque propositi est, neque facultatis nostræ. Quid de oratoribus dicam? qui, si qui unquam fuerint, hisce temporibus certe exstiterunt; eo-que præsertim videntur inclaruisse, quod artem quasi ab aliis separatam coluerint, et a communi vita longius semotam. Tantorum autem hominum facile princeps, iis laudibus offerri Demosthenes unice meruit, quibus ille "patriæ pater" apud Romanos vim oratoriam cumulavit, et rationes, ut ita dicam, subtiliter enucleatas, et exemplar eloquentiæ omnibus suis numeris absolutum posuit. Quod si ad hæc omnia accesserint summæ rerum politicarum astutiæ, summæ ingenii vis, et facetiarum lepos, quid tandem de ista tam ætlimabili maximarum rerum concordia jam dicemus? Denique Græcorum indoles; in eo certe religionibus adjuta, ea opera excogitavit et extendendo perfecta edidit, quorum eximie venustatis et splendoris ope magnitudinem suam ad vivum expressam adumbravit. Quid! si "quæ Parrhasius protulit aut Scopas" non nisi desiderio complectimur, si signis templisque Phidiæ manu elaboratis notam suam impressit ætas, tamen, quamvis inviti, fateri cogimur,

Nil oriturum alias, nil ortum tale——.

Et profecto, jam pridem quasi admirantes obstupescimus, et quænam fuerint hujusce rei causæ vehementer quærimus. Quid vero! an liberales artes pax sola et tranquillitas alere et fovere possunt? an apud singulas civitates sæculum, quale Augusti

---

<sup>1</sup> In oratore autem acumen dialecticorum, septentiæ philosophorum, verba prope poetarum, memoria jurisconsultorum, vox tragediorum, gestus penè summorum actorum est requirendus. Quamobrem nihil in hominum genere rarius perfecto oratōre inveniri potest. Quæ enim singularum rerum artifices si mediocriter adepti sunt, probantur, ea nisi omnia summa sint in oratore, probari non possunt. De Oratore, i. 28.

fuit, Janumque clausum desideramus, ubi nihil erat curarum, nihil tumultus, quod homines sevocaret a litterarum studio; sed otio et securitati, non solum privatæ, verum etiam publicæ impune indulgebant? Equidem hæc in causis apud Graios fuisse asseverare uolui; quicquid enim in litterarum studiis profecerint, id quaecunque demum fuerit, pacis auspicio non certe debitum. Inter arma et tumultus, seditionem, turbas, et exsilia, ad humaniora tamen excolenda tanquam sui juris accessere, et quid mens humana possit insigni erant posteris documento.

Omittendum igitur, quod specioso pacis nomine perducti quidam concessum uelint, in ea scilicet præcipuas quasdam inesse vires, quæ certis sæculis perfectionem artium vel solæ præstare possint. Causæ vero altius repetendæ: et cum ex scientiâ et litterarum cultu magna pars proveniat felicitatis nostræ; cum ille cultus intimam quasi conjunctionem habeat cum his causis, quibus res humanæ sensim promoventur; cum denique ex eodem complura in nos deriverentur, quorum ope et adjumentis ad bene beateque vivendum informemur; si, quod quarimus, perspicere volumus, breviter erit expendenda vitæ ratio et consuetudinis humanæ.

Jam vero ea lege vivimus, ut non nisi in societatem coeuntibus quæcunque aut optima nobis aut jucundissima dederit natura frui liceat. Quamobrem, cum solitariam vitam agentibus, omnia fere desint commoda, omnis etiam voluptas; conflata est hominibus communio, et quædam quasi utilitatum communicatio. Unde orta est societas, primo quidem rudis et inculta, quippe quæ corporis potius quam animi vires, et dura quasi ingenia in utilitatem suam vindicet.

Efficta igitur ante oculos imagine Civitatis, ne forte aliquis in animum inducat, parum ad incrementa artium referre quænam sit illius forma et Constitutio, observandum est, quanto facilius liberæ leges et instituta primitias et quasi semina civilis et limatioris vitæ geniali quodam calore tanquam ex nativo solo elicere, et fovere possint. Nam si incultæ adhuc hominum societati unus quidam præpositus fuerit solus et præpotens dominus, cujus statim arbitrium et voluntas legum ac juris loco adhibeantur, non tali auspicio ulla erit accensa lux ingenii; neque obtusa hominum et servilis indoles aut suis aut posteris aliquid magni aut utilis consulere habebit. Unde enim qui securitatem adeo ignorant, ut eorum copiam, quibus vita auctior fiat ac beatior, vix comparare audeant, prosequentur culturam animi et digna libertate studia?

Sin autem in rerum primordiis vel constituta fuerit respub-

lica, vel regis auctoritas æquo limite finita effuse et licenter nequeat vagari, tum demum legibus sua erit concessa vis, suus æquitati honos. Mox autem accedet otium et tranquillitas; unde hominum ingenia discendi opportunitates avide arripiunt, et sopito prius litterarum et scientiæ desiderio libenter indulgebunt. Interea adduntur etiam in annos potestas, opes, auctoritas; et rationes insuper vitæ in melius mutatae.

Quæ cum ita sint, mirum videri potest, ut, si Græciam excipias, nobilissima ingeniorum claritate sæcula regum magis, quam rerum-publicarum auspiciis summum suum splendorem assecuta fuerint. Quod tamen ita explicandum: ad alendas et quasi educandas artes necessaria libertas: at recordemur velim, nihil prorsus obstandi, cum semel sancitæ leges societatis, et certo quodam fœdere parta fuerit tranquillitas, quominus ad imperium transeat. Neque negandum est, istam, quæ in regum aulis habitare solet, quotidianæ consuetudinis elegantiam et perpolitam morum urbanitatem reconditioribus Musarum studiis quam maxime opitulari.

Ne vero in longius excurram, videtur ex iisdem causis, quæ facultates animi primum excitaverint, ea nasci, non nisi posteris temporibus proventura, litterarum atque artium perfectio. Cum enim tum primum mansuetioribus studiis impendatur cura, postquam divitiæ, potentia, auctoritas atque otium accesserint, nullo argumento sequitur his augescentibus illa simul auctiora fieri, et mutuis subsidiis adjuta ad eundem finem omnia conspiratura. Patefiunt enim mutuo ingeniorum certamini honores, præmia, imo vero quæcunque animum ad sublimes ausus allicere aut excitare possint; et tum demum omnibus ad rempublicam augendam et promovendam vires exserentibus, imperii vires stabilitæ. Itaque tempore uno ad summa rerum Civitas procedit; et quæ sæcula eam potestate atque opibus florentissimam exhibuerint, eadem dabunt animi facultates usu ac disciplina ad plenum consummatas. Perpulchra rerum dispositio! quam grato animo et pio constitutam agnoscimus, neque sorti cuilibet incertæ aut Fortunæ vicibus deberi confitemur.

Argumentis autem nulla plane fides haberi debet, nisi rebus atque eventu confirmentur. Spectandæ igitur Civitates, quibus insignior quidam et certis, circumscriptus sæculi litterarum honos atque artium contigerit. Quod si, quotquot adeamus, in iis inesse fateamur summam fere potestatem summæ optimorum studiorum perfectioni iisdem temporibus conjunctam, tum demum, si non rei veritatem consecutus, ab illa tamen non longe aberrasse videar.

Paucis igitur expendamus quis qualisque fuerit apud Græcos vitæ politioris ortus et incrementum. Artes et scientiæ ex Ægypto et Chaldæa in Græciam commigrarunt. Parvi primum habitæ, dein lente, et pedetentim succrevæ, donec vindicata sua populis libertas, et, quas Xerxes intenderat, retortæ in ipsius caput injuriæ victorum animos momento quodam et admirabili impetu concitassent. Tum vero emicuit, manicis quasi et pedicis excussis, ingenii vis insita, et impedimentis omnibus remotis, aliisque causis feliciter concurrentibus, in plena tandem luce spatiosa est intellectus humani venustas et magnitudo. Ortus est ex animorum et rerum motu cætus maximorum hominum. Mox autem æmulatio, morum scilicet et institutorum diversitate excitata flammam libertatis manu accensam, servitio tandem iterum restinguendam aluit ac sustentavit.

Sed et aliæ erant causæ, quæ aliquid forsitan ponderis et momenti in se haberent. Quid enim Græcis alma cœli temperies, quid amœnitas locorum ad perfectionem artium contulerint, nemo est profecto, modo vel leviter imbutus fuerit Musarum studiis, qui ignorare possit. Quin et obversata est pictorum et sculptorum oculis eximia quædam humani corporis pulchritudo: quæcunque autem in eo præstantissima inesse judicabant, ea statim in deorum imaginibus expressa et summa arte expolita referebant. Nec deerant Patriæ triumphis, nec Victoria, Poetarum ingenia perpetuo instigans, unde in promptu erat Æschylo ea haurire quæ civium suorum animos et oblectarent simul et ad altiora provocarent. Quod autem ad res politicas attinet, nihil est profecto, quod admiremur, Græcos in rebus administrandis tam subtili ingenio fuisse usos, cum tantæ et tam multæ essent intra satis arctos limites Respublicæ, diversis eadem, et, ut ita dicam, repugnantibus consiliis institutæ. Quid mirum insuper tantam fuisse Athenis oratorum gloriam, cum is esset status urbis et constitutio, ut per eloquentiam facillima pateret ad honores via; et qui optime concionaretur voluntati suæ obsequentem populum continuo haberet?

Quamobrem tot tantisque stimulis admotis, et jamdudum reposta materie, quæ subito quodam tactu concalesceret, uberima evasit in omni genere illustrium virorum copia; et exinde Græcia, nullis dissentientibus, immortalitatem sibi consecuta est. Atheniensium autem, quippe qui maxima discrimina subissent, et acriori studio libertatem colerent, commota magis et excitata indoles fructus largiores tulit. Longe alia vero Lacedæmoniorum fortuna. Nihil enim potuit contra Lycurgi leges et instituta scientiæ et litterarum amor. Adeo verum est, quod supra diximus, libertate profligata, profligari etiam ingenii sti-

mulos, prosternique omnem quæ ad nobiliora ducat intellectus humani vim et ἐνέργειαν.

Postquam autem Libertas extrema sua per Græciam fecerat vestigia, imposito Graiorum cervicibus servitutis iugo, ablata est continuo omnis optimarum artium materia, et victorum fortunas consecutæ feliciores terras petiere Musæ. Tum vero, rerum omnium ubertatem sinu suo Italia cumulavit, et mira quadam fecunditate maximos proventus tulit. Verum sicut causæ, quare satis ampla concessa sit Romanis litterarum laus, plane sunt ab iis diversæ, quibus elicitæ essent Graiorum ingenia, ita etiam laudes distinguendæ. Cedant autem alumni magistris suis: Athenis ergo Latium: præsertim cum in Tragœdia, ut cetera omittam, parum certe profecerint; cùm, tanquam fidi artium interpretes, nihil prope novi excogitarint; et quamvis in arctiora quadam spatia studiorum suorum limites contraxissent, adeo tamen non auctiores facti sunt, ut passim inferiores audiant.

Romani ex rudi quadam et inculta gente primordia sua et originem duxere; illis item in partibus, quibus nulla adhuc offusa esset litterarum lux et scientiæ: quarum certe vestigia, si qua a majoribus essent conservata, sive incuria sive contemptu prorsus despiciebant posteri. Ergo per quingentos fere annos nulla omnino, aut levissima certe comparuit artium cognitio, et rara quædam scientiæ cupiditas. Quid vero! an qui universos pariter, quibuscunque decertarent, virtute atque armis devicere, utebantur tamen per tot sæcula crassiori Minerva, et tenuiori ingeniorum vena? an in iis erat diversa quædam, ut ita dicam, animorum materia, neque eadem, quam ætas postera sub eodem Jove expolivit? Prohibet quoniam communis omnium sensus, tum rei veritas, ne Romanorum in litteris atque artibus inscitia, tam futili atque inani conjecturæ tribuatur.

Melius autem dicitur, quod et expositis supra argumentis quam maxime videtur suffragari, nihil in litterarum cultu potuisse effici, quantum civitas pro salute pariter atque imperio, pro vita pariter ac honore dimicaret. Mira vero rerum dispositio eo usque hujusmodi novitates distulerat, donec Romani populi ingenium eas quidem libentius adhibere vellet. Illis datum erat potiri imperio totius terrarum orbis; undique autem conquisita et firmiter demum stabilita auctoritate et potentia, ea quasi delinimenta accedere oportebat, quorum deliciis mitesceret ingenium, et feritatem tandem deponeret victoris animus. Ergo

Græcia capta serum victorem cepit, et artes  
Intulit agresti Latio.

Jam vero imperii vires et litterarum cultus, quippe quæ mutua invicem auxilia et opportunitates suppeditarent, æquis passibus ad summa gloriæ suæ fastigia pervenere. Præpotentem scilicet Romam, simulque elegantissimis artibus et omni litterarum genere excultissimam sub Augusto admiramur. Illa imitatrix Græciæ, Graiorum exemplis animum intentum habuit, et quasi communicata gloria, armis et virtute princeps, ingeni laudibus secunda, terris regina imperavit. Quare bene et sapienter suos monuit, tanquam futuri præscia, poetæ vox :

Excedent alij spirantia mollius æra,  
 'Credo equidem ; vivos ducent de marmore vultus,  
 Orabunt causas melius, cœlique meatus  
 Describent radio, et surgentia sidera dicent :  
 'Tu, regere imperio populos, Romane, memento ;  
 .Hæc tibi erunt artes.

Apud Romanos autem jampridem grassari cœperat luxuria, secunda illa malorum genetrix, quæ in potestatem imperii lento quodam et tacito, at certo pede et pestifero invasit. Tum vero exortum, depravatis studiis, et ingravescente undequaque licentia, insulsum quoddam litterarum genus ; cecidit vigor animi stylique dignitas ; et qui puriores adhuc effluerant fontes ingenii, jam demum quasi ex Epicuri hortis in Romam derivati turpi quadam et immunda contagione omnia passim inquinaverunt. Quamvis enim aliqui ex Imperatoribus, qui Augusti solio sceptroque potiti sunt, mira quædam integritatis et prudentiæ ediderint exempla, et labefactas imperi vires pro facultate sua sustentarint, nihil tamen illa valuit rara quidem, et, ut ita dicam, longis quasi intervallis distincta virtus. Mox autem regionum deliciis inducti et populorum imbecillitate, barbari præscriptos fines contentim transiluire : dilapsæ sunt Romanorum res ; ademptus honor nemini ; humanitatisque studiis et culturæ animi nox longa et tenebricosa supervenit.

Et profecto, si non omni spe destituta, at nulla certe in se habens auspicia melioris ævi, in profunda quadam caligine demersa, sopitis tanquam in æternum ingeniis, procubuit Europa. Verum, ne penitus exciderent omnia antiquitatis vestigia tantorum virorum ope et laboribus impressa, prohibuit quum salva adhuc Byzantini imperii potestas, tum qui mox exortus est inter Arabas liberalium artium et scientiarum amor. Accensæ enim hominum Cupiditates religionis novæ illecebris miro quodam modo ad humanos sensus accommodatæ ; tantisque stimulis permoti de magna parte Asiæ Arabes triumpharunt : cum imperio vero, ut supra dictum est, et ut plerumque evenit,

---

<sup>1</sup> A. D. circiter 400.

bonæ artes, litteræ cæteraque vitæ excultioris commoda et oblectamenta in melius promoventur; et, ne longius externa prosequar, quantumvis a cultu impio abhorreamus, at quodcunque tamen mitiora studia excolendo ad veritatis lucem conservandam Arabes contulerint, libentissime agnoscimus.

Jam vero, ne causas indagare velim, quibus iterum excitata, excusso tandem veterino et socordia, tanquam in nova quædam humanæ vitæ officia Europa prodiit, vetat quum propositi nostri, tum etiam brevitatis ratio. Italia autem mira quadam felicitate et fortuna integram priscæ virtutis vim, decus, et splendorem princeps revocavit. Deinde exorta sunt nova artium imperia; eo etiam maxima, quod continuata serie usque ad hæc nostra tempora sua vi floruerint, atque indies nobiliora facta universam et clarissimam lucem undique diffundant.

Maxima illa rerum mutatio, unde civilis vitæ decor ac pulchritudo denuo renasci cœpit, non nisi singulari quodam et ingenti animorum motu absolvi potuit. Ergo ubi Musarum studium et amorem quasi ex inferis oportuit excitari, ortus est ille<sup>1</sup> Italicorum poeta, quem omnes uno ore præstantem et egregium pronuntiant, ad quem vero imitandum nemo unquam pervenit. Ille, alter quasi Homerus, litteras jampridem oblutantes tenebris in apertam lucem vindicavit; primisque istius gloriæ iustitit vestigiis, quam sequentia sæcula Italiæ confirmaverunt.

Cum veteribus autem non minimæ quidem istarum laudum partes communicandæ, eo præsertim, quod eorum opera imitando, et tanquam perfecta artium in omni genere exemplaria perscrutando Italiæi recentiores viam sibi ad excellentem quandam et immortalem gloriam aperuere. Ille enim, quem supra memoravi, Virgilii studio accensus et amore, summum profecto poetam præcipua quadam coluit intentione animi. Mox etiam Petrarca<sup>2</sup> priscum quoddam et simplex Latini sermonis decus et integritatem revocavit. Iisdem fere temporibus pictorum et sculptorum ingeniis magna quædam admota sunt incitamenta, acriora eadem et celerioris effectus, quia quantum in eodem genere Graii effecerant, tum primum diligentius observarent.

Ex his igitur primordiis reviviscere et quasi recreari cœpit, et ad nobiliora excitari litterarum amor, et omnes uno impetu ad optimarum artium studia vehementer ferri. Magna utique tum temporis exstiterunt poetarum ingenia, quod ut in omni populo primum fere excolitur humanitatis genus, ita perfectionem primum assequitur, et plenam quasi maturitatem. Reliqua autem

<sup>1</sup> Dante Alighieri. A. D. 1265. 1321.

<sup>2</sup> A. D. 1304. 1374.



liberalium artium studia, si lento magis, at nequaquam incerto pede, cultorum suorum vocibus obtemperabant.

Stabilita interea Mediceorum auctoritas, et Italico nomini honor denuo accessit. Mox autem, everso Byzantinorum<sup>1</sup> imperio, complures Græcorum fuga et exilio compulsi in Italiam se recepere; neque ingratum profecto aut indignum erat refugii pretium ac salutis; non pauca enim secum deduxere, quorum ope et adjumentis aureus ille dies gravissimorum principum<sup>2</sup> hortatu et auspiciis tandem iterum illuxit.

Insidebant interim tanquam in visceribus pontificalis potentiae et auctoritatis tot et tanta corruptelae semina, ut gravior facta quam pro suis ipsius viribus, ab alto isto solio Romana iterum dignitas corruerit, quod quidem honestaverat caeca quaedam pietas, et, ut ita dicam, mendaciis eblandita superstitio. Tum vero, exaucta libertate animi, Europae oculis nova quaedam offusa lux et splendor veritatis. Quia et Britanniae clarissima effulsit; et quem in occasu solem vano adhuc desiderio Italici prosequuntur, eundem in primo ortu nostri salutarunt. Nihil autem in ullo quovis studiorum genere, quae tum primum inclaruere, admirabilius aut magis dignum memoria, quam insignis illa optimorum hominum eruditio, ac doctrina, qui summa fide, ingenio, integritate et constantia puram et simplicem religionis formam ab ineptiis vindicarunt.

Quamobrem, ut Hispanos et Lusitanos taceam, (quamvis non minima quaedam ex eorum historia argumento auctoritas<sup>3</sup> accedat,) ad ea demum tempora perventum est, in quibus quum Galliae, tum nostrae ipsorum patriae, subacti laudes et exculti ingenii in primis adjudicandae. Illa vero tum<sup>4</sup> temporis auctoritate florentissima et imperio, ingenuas artes et humaniora studia excoluit, magni regis ductu et auspiciis, qui singulari quaedam prudentia ac fortuna diu regnum administravit. Britannis autem indies accedebat novus quidam libertatis amor, quo nihil magis sopita hominum ingenia excitare valet; et, ut vere dicam, Naturae et Genii sui monitis non surdis auribus Britannia auscultavit.

Quod si quænam apud nostros tempora insigni quodam maximorum hominum concursu celebrata fuerint definiri placeat, (ut nihil de hodie viventibus aut nuper mortuis adjiciam, his enim quantæ erunt laudes tribuendæ æquius et facilius adjudi-

<sup>1</sup> A. D. 1453.      1. Cosmo de Medici.   2. Lorenzo de Medici.  
3. Leo X.

<sup>3</sup> Namque his etiam in eadem temporum spatia consentiunt summa imperii potestas, et summus litterarum bonos.

<sup>4</sup> Regnante Ludovico XIV.

cabunt posteri,) istam iis præsertim temporibus gloriam largiamur, ubi inauditos pæne triumphos foris Marlburius reportavit. Tum vero cum elegantia et suavitate philosophari instituit Addisonus: arcana autem naturæ Newtonus indagavit; suos etiam erudit simul et delectavit moralis ille, lepidus idem et facetus, et in unaquaque operis parte egregius poeta; et eminuit innumera quædam, ut ita dicam, in omni genere hominum litteratorum cohors.

Videndum est tamen, annon jam diversa sit harum rerum ratio; neque eadem omnino, quæ apud veteres certorum temporum celebritati, aliorum quasi dispendio, consuluit. Complura enim, et ea maxima, Britannis supersunt nomina, quæ nequaquam iisdem ætatum spatiis comprehendî possunt. Summus noster Tragicus, primus idem et præstantissimus, dignis certe sociis, at paucioribus tamen adjutus, ætatem suam amplissimo honore, æternisque laudibus exornavit. Quid Baconum et Lockium proferam? illum, qui novas vires addidit philosophiæ, novasque et integras vias patefecit: hunc vero, qui admirabili quadam vi ingenii et pæne divina secreta et interiora animi subiecit oculis, et occultiores latebras detexit? Quid Miltonum? qui sive argumenti materiam spectare velis, sive facultates animi in tali materia versantes, poetarum princeps optimo quodam jure haberi meruit.

Quare autem res ita fuerit ex ipso humanarum rerum progressu videtur quodammodo explicandum. Evenit enim ætati nostræ, quod et de superiori concessum velim, ut accensis hominum ingeniis, tam infinita sit litterarum atque artium varietas, tam lata atque ampla pateat ad honorem via, ut nulla fere tempora maximis suis viris carere possint. Cavendum est, ne hæc tam clara studia in perversa et præpostera excedant: cavendum est, ne relicta studiorum dignitate, ad ineptia quædam et leviora se recipiant posteriorum ingenia, et, quod passi sunt Romani, putidum quoddam et insulsum ingravescat litterarum genus: "difficilis autem" ut Paterculi verbis utar, "in perfecto mora est."

Quid vero! nonne adhuc imperfecta est scientia, et quædam vixdum inchoatæ artes? sunt et fortasse, quæ prorsus lateant, et creatricem vim ingenii jampridem expectent. Tendit autem in ulterius hominum natura; et, cum quotidiana quadam experientia quamplurima coacervet, iis statim utitur, et communem quasi scientiæ et prosperitatis summam hominibus adauget. Ita, quot labuntur anni, tot bonorum omnium accessiones videntur quasi spondere, ea esse aliquando ventura sæcula, ubi liberalium artium perfectio non arctis quibusdam finibus contenta,

sed universo terrarum orbe, complures jam sepultos tenebris clarissima luce illustrabit. Quanta autem eorum erit felicitas et fortuna, quorum fuerit adeo exoptandis temporibus interesse, iisque revera frui, quæ dum spe tantum, quasi ex longinquo contemplamur, jucundissimam quandam animo expectationem capimus, integram, simplicem, et liberis hominibus vere dignam voluptatem!

GEORGIUS A. DENISON.

E COLL. ORIEL.

---

OXFORD LATIN PRIZE POEM,  
FOR 1828.

---

MACHINÆ VI VAPORIS IMPULSÆ.

Ευνώμοσαν γὰρ ὄντες ἔχθιστο. τὸ πρὶν  
Πῦρ καὶ Θάλασσα.

**ERGO** elementorum rabiem indefessa furentum  
 Fœdere conciliare novo, et discordia rerum  
 Semina vi magica cæcisque adnectere vinclis,  
 Fas impune homini! Mundi diffusa per artus  
 Diditur, et toto nitet ordine Diva Creatrix,  
 Omniparens: sæclis adeo nascentibus ipsa  
 Adfuit—ipsa favens ægris conatibus, artis  
 Materiem dedit, et primordia notitiat.  
 Nonne vides, si quando atra de nube refulcens  
 Sol jubar extulerit, pluviosque fugaverit imbres,  
 Ut laxata vapor se per spiramina terræ  
 Erumpat, densusque cavis convallibus humor  
 Crassæque exsurgant nebulæ, et qua parte calorem  
 Ebiberint, tepida sudent ulgine glebæ?  
 Fœdere non alio, fervore exercita flammæ,  
 Dediscit morem Unda suum, spatiumque capessit  
 Liberior, solitaque negat compage teneri.  
 Quippe ubi supposito spumescunt igne lebetes,  
 Fervent intus aquæ; vis inde exorta vaporis  
 Certatim discedere avet, cupilleque petissit  
 Omnem aditum, clausique hinc inde foramina aheni.  
 Quin, (si vera fides) inter penetralia terræ  
 Volvuntur hquido igne Jacus, subtusque profundis  
 Fluviorum immiscent se fontibus: inde moveri,  
 Exardente vzporum turbine, material  
 Congeries, et stratorum superincumbentum

Disrumpi avulsæ moles ; liquefacta videmus  
Fragmina saxorum, rutilasque rotare favillas  
Ætnæ arcem ignivomam, dorsumque nivale Vesevi  
Mixtam sulphureo torquere bitumine arenam !

Haud alia elementa, et magni machina mundi  
Concordem servant, discordi lege, tenorem.  
Nimirum in medium, socia æta cupidine, cernas  
Omnia conitti : qua vi collisa, necesse est  
Ad nihilum redigi, aut misceri corpore corpus—  
At se per totam subtile caloris acumen  
Insinuat molem, et corpuscula densa relaxans  
Ulterius prohibet coalescere, particulasque  
Distinet oppositæ, discretaque semina rerum.

His animadversis, miræ patet artis origo :  
Hinc ingens orditur opus. Stat mole minagi,  
Artificisque refert longos operosa labores  
Machina ; circum areto compages ferrea nexu,  
Centumque adstringunt laterum tabulata catenæ.  
Fit raucum interea murmur ferventis aquæ,  
Vulcanoque ingens Vas æstuat : inde Vapores,  
Qua data porta, ruunt, eluctanturque citati  
Per tubulum, pulsantque fores, aditusque lacessunt :  
Claustra patent, ultroque recludunt ostia valvæ.  
It binas vapor iste vias, et utrinque cylindro  
Sese infert : pars ima petit, sursumque resultans  
Ingestum indignatur onus, præscriptaque tollit  
Pondera ; converso pars deprimit altera motu.  
Binæ adeo dubio oppositæ discrimine vires  
Pugnarent lite æterna, nisi utrique vicissim  
Atria manitæ spatiis vacuata paterent.  
Ergo, vice exacta, plenoque gemente cylindro,  
Claustorum impatiens erumpit inutilis humor,  
Et gelido demersus aquarum fonte, residit.  
Hinc iterum latices condensos excipit alveo  
Vas, igni impositum : calefactæ rursus aquæ vis  
Emicat exultim, instauratque novata vigorem.

Jamque sonare fragor, penitusque impulsa cieri  
Machina : quin stridore gravi surgitque caditque  
Libra ingens : gemini, sursum deorsumque rotata,  
Versantur globuli, seque axem limite certo  
Circumagunt ; quanto illa cito magis impete fertur,  
Tanto illi a medio spatia in majora recedunt  
Latius, effusumque magis volvuntur in orbem.  
Altiùs insurgunt adeo, impulsaque catena  
Motant infixam tubulo clavim, inque peditis

---

<sup>1</sup> Angl. "throttle-valve."

Valvarum portis, prohibent se inferre vaporum  
 Agmina conglomerata, æstusque immane furentes.  
 At vero, quoties languet cunctantior ictus,  
 Præcipiti actutum revolubilis orbita gyro  
 Momento volat ipsa suo, hærentemque rotarum  
 Exagitat seriem, et tardatos succutit axes.

Vis illinc, quocunque moventis dextra propellat,  
 Fertur, et ad varios vitæ se porrigit usus.  
 Secto etenim in præceps puteo, terebraque tenebris  
 Rite exploratis, demittit in ima catenarum  
 Ordinem, et immæni carbonum pondere moles  
 Machina sursum agit, abruptisque metalla barathris.

Dulci ergo auferimur regione, ubi ridet amæno  
 Auræ lux cælo, lateque innubilis æther,  
 Visceraque ingredimur terrarum, altaque silentes  
 Nocte locos. Agit excubias, instatque labori  
 Fossorum manus infelix, queis mille pericla  
 Præsentem vario portendunt omine mortem,  
 Mille mali facies! Sensus ibi sæpe gravatos  
 Torpor iuers premit et pellacia subdola somni  
 Obruit (heu! triste indicium)—tremere excita tellus  
 Sub pedibus: mussare solum: se quisque supinum  
 Stravit humi: volat inde procellæ sævior ala  
 Turbinis ignæa vis, divolsaque saxa sub auras  
 Contorquet, lacerosque artus. Quin sæpe furentium  
 Undarum fremuere iræ, penitusque cavernas  
 Diluvio opplerunt: censes, agmine facto,  
 Magnos exundasse profundis fontibus amnes,  
 Ruptisque immissum bacchari Acheronta fodinis.

Sed miseris tulit auxilium, certasque salutis  
 Ars nova suppetias. Subtile per abdita terræ  
 Imperium agnoscunt, omnique ex parte coactæ,  
 Mille per ambages et cæca foramina, in unum  
 Conglomerantur aquæ: puteo dein haurit ab imo  
 Machina proluviem undarum, et sursum trahit ingens  
 Antlia: siccatis latebris iuamæna recedunt  
 Flamina, pestiferæque fugit gravis halitus auræ.  
 Obliviscier hinc curas trepidosque timores  
 Fossorem videas—hinc lumine lætitiæ  
 Fœdam hominum illuviem torvosque nitescere vultus!

Freti ope non alia, studio leviores coloni  
 Durum opus exercent. Per hiantes gleba meatus  
 Sentit inassuetos arcani mominis haustus;  
 Tristiaque exhalans ubi semina pestis Avernæ  
 Torpuerat longo tellus obducta veterno,  
 Ridet agro subitum decus, et regione salubri  
 Aurea temperies, verisque inopina venustas!

Scilicet et—pictis quamvis in vallis hortos  
Alma Parens, myrteumque nemus, cœlumque negarit  
Purpureum—fœcunda tamen per pascua cernit  
Luxuriam segetum flavasque Batavia messes.  
Subsidet limosa palus,<sup>1</sup> æstusque per artem  
Sentiet exhaustos; licet hiuc, vasto objice ripæ  
Indignata coerceri, fletat usque sonantis  
Ira maris—graveolenti illinc uligine campos  
Oppleat humor iners, stagnique inamabilis unda.

Nequicquam mediæ dirimens confinia terræ  
Oceani effrœnas plaga dividit invia gentes!  
Nequicquam intentans furias, ciet æquora Nereus  
Horrendum bacellata, voraginibusque profundis  
Audentes vetat ire viros:—sopita recusant  
Frustra flamina opem, Zephyrusque ac turbidus Auster  
Vana per Æolias deducunt otia rupes!  
Aspice! quisque iter flectas, ubi fervidus undas  
In mare devolvit Thamesis pater, aut ubi blando  
Clyda Caledonias interstrepit æquore valles;  
Lympharum in tremula facie cum lassa recumbit  
Aura, silentque leves per glauca cubilia venti;  
Aspice! “protelo plagarum continuato”<sup>2</sup>  
Scindit aquam ratis, insultatque obstantibus undis  
Remigio veloque carens; volat aëre turbo  
Spumeus, et longo canescunt tramite fluctus.

Heu! quoties stragis media in discrimina nautas  
Raptura ignaros—quoties gravis ipsa ruina—  
Radis iter liquidum! Sæpe ignea carcere nubes  
Sæviit, et perterricrepto displosa fragore  
Torsit agens secum laceræ fragmenta carinæ,  
Truncatasque virum formas: aut per freta ponti  
Vehementi (horrendum!) navis navim impulit ictu  
Nocte intempesta:—exaudires dira ululantes  
Plangere aquam nisu assiduo: laxantur ibidem  
Enerves artus, resonatque in gurgite vasto,  
Faucibus erumpens extrema inter fugientis  
Vitæ luctamina discidiumque animæ, vox!  
—Stragem adeo infandam et crudelia funera pauci  
Insatiabiliter deflemus, et usque soventes  
Luctum ægro sub corde, plagis inhiamus aquarum,  
Suspiciamusque oculis: illæ placido ore videntur  
Insultare malis lacrymasque illudere inanes!

Prodigium interea magnus stupet orbis, et artis  
Egregium miratur opus. Columbia molem,

<sup>1</sup> The Haarlem Meer. Vide Encycl. Brit. tom. xix.

<sup>2</sup> Lucret. lib. ii. 531.

308 *Oxford Latin Prize Poem, for 1828.*

Incinctam picea nebula, flammisque vomentem,  
Vidit Atlantiaci superantem claustra profundi.  
Intremuit visu, vitreasque refugit in aulas  
Nerendum clorus ad Laurenti rauca fluenta,  
Et ripas, Oronooka, tuas: trepidusque Panamæ  
Incola montanorum adit sacraia Divum,  
Solem oraturus patrium, Geniosque locorum!  
Quin vagus arte nova lustrat Gaugetis arenas  
Navita, Persarumque domos, vastoque Mysoræ  
Regna situ; purove sub æthere captat odores,  
Arva ubi Taprobanes semper florentis Eeos  
Fortunata virent interlucetia fluctus.

Hei mihi! quod turpes tali petat arte triumphos  
Gens, mælsana hominum, necdum exsaturata furores  
Arma acuat bello et Marti nova tela ministret!  
Nimirum valida compage inclusa vaporum  
Vis furit, et claustris stridens luctatur alienis;  
Dein agitata foras, disrupto turbine, ferri  
Ejectat tempestatem, et nimbis vomit ignes  
Sulphureis: directa acie dant agmina cladem  
Turmatim, et magnæ vastantur stragibus urbes!  
Mollior olim ætas scelus aversatur, et artes  
Exhorret sero patrias: stupet incola passim  
Disiectas nigrorum arces, ævique peracti  
Lugubre contemplan monumentum, mœnia pallet  
Strata solo, refugitque feros meminisse parentes.

At non auguriis adeo infelicibus oras  
Fausta per Angliacas versantur munia pacis,  
Nativæque vigent insuetis viribus artes.  
Ergo non durum impendent sub nocte laborem  
(Livida dum fractos macies depascitur artus)  
Carceribus clausi artifices; non tenuia carpunt  
Pensa, neque assiduo pertentant pectine telas:  
Fusile nec flammis, orbatu luce diei,  
Evolvunt stannum, nec ferri forcipe massas  
Informant: istos se machina flectit in usus  
Pulsibus acta novis, arcanæque persentiscens  
Organicæ momenta manus, celeri incitat ictu  
Mille rotarum axes, revolutosque ordine gyros.  
—Excidio ex ipso ac morborum strage recenti  
Arridet roseo ore Salus, vegetoque vigore  
Enitet exoriens: Arabum sic fertur in oris  
Ales odorato e cinere ambustisque parentis  
Ossibus enasçi formosior; ille per auras  
Ardet abire leves, viriditque animosa juventa  
Fingit membra fugæ, et pictas quatit æthere pennas.  
Non tibi terrarū pandit sinus, Anglia, gazas

Lumine gemmarum fulvoque interlitus auro--  
Non tibi dædaleis subridet scena rosarum  
Floribus, ambrosiæve immurmurat halitus auræ  
Citrea per nemora et redolentes cinnama sylvas  
Sed soluta erigitur modis sublime procellis  
Auro Asiæ et lati spoliis Orientis onustum;  
Sed patriæ armigeris tutatur littora dextris  
Martia gens; sed magni animi, rerumque capaces,  
Procedunt artes melius, dulcique repertas  
Expoliunt studio:--exultim mens vivida fines  
Transgreditur sibi præscriptos, normasque latentes  
Ardet acuta acie atque oculo propiore tueri;  
Sæu juvet, impellente Deo, dare commoda vitæ,  
Auxilioque levare viros; seu mystica rerum  
Principia et cæco scrutantem fœdere causas  
Raptet amœnus amor, mixtoque pavore voluptas.

T. LEIGH CLAUGHTON,

E. COLL. TRIN.

---

OXFORD ENGLISH PRIZE POEM,  
FOR 1828.

---

RICHARD CŒUR DE LION.

Θυμὸν γε λέων ἐμὸν, ὡς θύου' εἶχεν.—ΑΝΤ. Γ. ΓΡÆC

HIGH praise be theirs, when rest was Salem's power  
Who throng'd to combat round her ruin'd tower;  
From her gall'd neck to wrest the heathen chain;  
To loose the captive daughter's bonds again;  
And the glad symbol of the cross expand  
In crimson beauty o'er the Saviour's land.

Agès have lapsed: her holy champions gone,  
The tyrant Soldan fills Judæa's throne.  
Mid the lone ruin, one deserted fane  
Stands the sole record of the Christian's reign,  
Where e'en the spoiler sheathed his ruthless blade,  
And Profanation's trembling arm was stay'd.  
Yet have her silent valleys heard afar  
The minstrel's harp, the stirring shouts of war.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Chateaubriand, *Itinéraire à Jérusalem*, tome ii. p. 279. "Une seule église fut épargnée, et ce fut l'église du Saint Sépulcre."



Hark! sweetly floating o'er the martial throng,  
 Wild as himself, Vidal's inspiring song;<sup>1</sup>  
 And see! uprousing from his island lair,  
 Poitou's stern lord, Britannia's king is there.  
 Link'd with a band of brothers, sworn to brave  
 The battle's peril, and the ocean's grave,—  
 Yet went he smiling from his father's hall,  
 As speeding forth to some glad festival;  
 While joyously his death-doom'd squadrons move  
 To the light lays of visionary love,  
 Soft as the Dorian flute:—for courage high  
 Owns not the need of loftier melody:—  
 And to those minstrel warriors stoop'd the proud,  
 When Cyprus trembled, and Sicilia bow'd.

Onward they move; while high in eastern state,  
 Worthy his arm, unconquer'd thousands wait.  
 Couch'd 'neath the date-empurpled palm-tree's shade,  
 The sable banners to the sun display'd,  
 For the wild precincts of their desert land,  
 Their scanty fountains, and their fiery sand,  
 See! val'rous chiefs their wind-swift coursers wheel,  
 And whet on Kishon's banks the patriot steel:—  
 A changeless face, whose giant might of old  
 In shadowy types the mystic visions told;  
 O'er whose dark import, on Messina's shore,  
 'Tis said his eagle spirit loved to pore.<sup>2</sup>

Yet lo! they fall:—where frown'd th' insulting foe,  
 Each passing peasant spurns the Mamluke bow;  
 And trampled lowly in the dust appear  
 Th' Egyptian's scourges, and the Bedoween's spear.  
 And who their victor? came he to the fight  
 With arm, that curb'd the champing charger's might?  
 With helm, reflecting back the sunbeam's ray?  
 Or falchion, cleaving its resistless way?  
 No,—on the pallet's humble mattress laid,  
 From his wan cheek health's blushing roses fade;<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Pierre Vidal, de Toulouse, troubadour qui suivit le roi Richard à la troisième croisade, ne s'est pas rendu moins célèbre par ses extravagances, que par son talent poétique." *Littérature du Midi de l'Europe* par M. de Sismondi, tome i. p. 177.

<sup>2</sup> See "Roger de Hoveden Annals," (folio edition, 1596,) p. 385. for an interesting account of a conversation between Richard and Joachim, abbot of Calabria, respecting the interpretation of certain parts of the Apocalypse.

<sup>3</sup> The fact of Richard's being brought on the field in a pallet, during the siege of Acre, in consequence of illness, and levelling the engines of war from his couch, is given in Mill's *Hist. of the Crusades*, vol. ii. p. 45.

Wasted his strength; the gleaming morion's pride  
Cast in keen anguish from his brow aside;—  
Yet Acre fear'd, as twang'd the fateful string,  
E'en on his couch, the Lion-hearted King.

What marvel then, if o'e. th' ensanguined plain  
Pour'd sad Azotus all her strength in vain,  
Or if, reclining on her ruin'd throne,  
Mourn'd the fall'n Queen, dismantled Ajalon,  
When, nerveless now no more, his healthful hand  
Wielded the terrors of the magic brand,  
By Arthur borne, beneath whose charmed spell  
Each shadowy knight, and phantom warrior fell,  
Nor less shall Mecca's paynim heroes turn  
Still from thy edge, "resistless Kaliburn."

Weep, city of the saints—religion's sway  
Kindles round thee the tumult of the fray;  
Round thee, by Moslem deem'd the hallow'd seat,  
Where the freed tenants of the tomb shall meet;  
Round thee, where views the Christian's purer faith  
With tearful joy his Saviour's scene of death,  
While rings at twilight on his startled ear  
The herald's cry, "Save, save the sepulchre."<sup>2</sup>

No beaming glance of triumph hails thee now:—  
With eye despondent, and with clouded brow,  
Tho' victor, leaning on his useless sword,  
Bends the proud form of Albion's baffled lord.  
Degen'rate France! his thoughts were fix'd on thee,  
Thy knights home speeding o'er the midland sea,—  
Thy vows abandon'd, and thy faith forsworn,—  
Thy prince, that left the lion heart forlorn.  
He turn'd, where, slumb'ring in their calm repose,  
The captive city's towers of beauty rose,  
Where her unrescued halls the faithless trod,  
And her closed portals held the foes of God,—  
And sadly waking from his cherish'd dream,  
Shunn'd to behold, since powerless to redeem.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Resistless Kaliburn he wields."—WARTON'S CRUSADE.

See Warton's Hist. of English Poetry, vol. i. p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> "The army always halted at night-fall; heralds thrice cried aloud, 'Save the holy Sepulchre.'"—MILL'S Hist. of the Crusades, vol. ii. p. 53.

<sup>3</sup> "The hero (Richard) ascending an hill, and veiling his face, exclaimed with an indignant voice, 'Those who are unwilling to rescue, are unworthy to view, the sepulchre of Christ.'"—GIBBON'S Decline and Fall, vol. xi. p. 148.

The red cross past—on Jaffa's star-lit shore  
Hush'd is the war-cry, and the fight is o'er;  
And far in Austria's shades thy sun hath set,  
Light of the brave, renown'd Plantagenet!

Is this thy faith, false Prince?—The gen'rous 'foc'  
Cool'd his lip's fever with the draught of snow;  
For him in bounty spread the sparkling feast,  
Crown'd with the fruitage of the glowing East,  
And frankly stooping from his high command,  
Ask'd but the surety of his profler'd hand.<sup>2</sup>  
But thou, sworn friend, when bright his fortune shone  
Buckling with him thy crested armour on,  
Proud if he gave, 'in those tempestuous days,  
The welcome meed of his all-courtred praise,  
'Tho' fleetly gliding from thy changeful heart,  
All but the rankling stings of envy part,  
Thou canst not chace the fairy forms that bless  
His musing thoughts, and soothe his loneliness.

Romantic Poesy! 'twas thine to shed  
Thy radiant halo round the captive's head.  
Oh welcome in the bright and laughing mood,  
But dearer far, when all is solitude,  
How err'd the Grecian bard,<sup>3</sup> who deem'd thy power  
Sway'd but the sparkling bowl,—the festive hour,  
Leaving the sad and destitute to pine  
Without one solace from a note like thine;  
For faithful still, those darksome cells among,  
Wreath'd thy "gay science"<sup>4</sup> all its flowers of song.

Music! for thee hell's shadowy gates unclosed,  
And the rack'd spirit on his wheel reposed:—  
Oh! ill hath fable fix'd thy fancied throne  
High on the top of sunny Helicon;

<sup>1</sup> See Mill's Hist. (from Hoveden) vol. ii. p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> "Daus ce Traité de Trêve, qui fut conclu l'an 588. de l'hégire, Ben Schúhnah remarque, que ni le Roi d'Angleterre, ni Saladin, ne jurèrent point, mais donnèrent seulement leur main."—D'Hérbelot, Bibliothèque Orient. p. 744.

<sup>3</sup> ————  
 ἔμνους ἐπὶ μὲν θαλάσσι,  
 ἐπὶ τ' εἰσπίναις, καὶ παρὶ δειπνοῖς  
 εὐροντο, βίον τετραπλῆς ἀποιός·  
 ὅστυγίους δὲ βροτῆς οὐδὲν λώπας  
 εὐρετο μούσῃ καὶ πολυχόρδοις  
 ἰδοῖς παύειν———. EURIP. MELER. 195.

<sup>4</sup> "Fl' gai Saber." Sismondi Littér. du Midi de l'Europe.

Or, by Castalia's fount, and Pimple's stream  
Placed thee rejoicing in the noon-tide beam :—  
Thy holier shrine is in affliction's gloom,  
The maniac's chamber, or the darkling tomb ;  
When list'ning frenzy, heedless of his chain,  
Wears the soft smile of infancy again ;  
When hopeless sorrow, as she drinks the lay,  
Lifts her pale form, and wipes her tears away ;  
As now, while burning with thy living fire,  
The minstrel monarch sweeps his mournful lyre :—  
Mark how, sure index of the kindling soul,  
His eyes with all a Prophet's prescience roll ;  
List, while to rapture bursts the breathing line,  
" Perpetual thralldom shall not yet be mine." \*

Did not a Seraph answer—like the sound  
Heard floating oft the sainted death-bed round,  
When heav'n born music, bidding sorrow cease,  
Wafts some pure spirit to the realms of peace ?  
No—sweet, but earthly, each re-echo'd word  
Has gently thrill'd on Memory's slumbering chord ;  
Recalling seasons, when the cloudless sky  
Inspired the notes of buoyant liberty,  
And Blondell sung, 'mid wine and beauty gay,  
The playful " tenson," and the sportive lay.  
Fear not that fancy prompts th' illusive strain ;  
Thy own loved minstrel comes to loose thy chain.

Yet not his lyre alone the dungeon broke :—  
To aid the late repentant island woke ;  
And, pour'd by thee, the eloquent appeal  
Compell'd the proudest and the worst to feel,  
Till rugged vet'rans, at the tale grown weak,  
Dew'd with unwonted tears their pallid cheek. †

Hark to the jubilant and joyous cry  
That heralds Albion's glad festivity !  
He comes, her champion of the cross beloved,  
Like the pure ore, by fiery trials proved,  
Purged from the failings of his youthful prime,  
The dross of passion, and the stain of crime.

\* " Je sai de voir que ja trop longuement  
Ne seirie ca puis,"

are lines found in a sirvente composed by Richard during his imprisonment—they are rendered in Burney's *Hist. of Music*,  
" Perpetual thralldom is not yet my doom."

† See Matthew Paris, p. 121.

314 *Oxford English Prize Poem, for 1828.*

He parted, thirsting for his foeman's blood,  
Haughty and ruthless in his angry mood ;—  
He comes, affliction's soften'd child, to bear  
Pardon to those that tremble and despair ;  
Lock'd in his breast, forgotten vengeance slept,  
And love rekindled, when the traitor wept.

Yes,—while low crouching on his suppliant knee,  
He fears an injured brother's stern decree,  
He little knows where gen'rous passions live :—  
The mean are cruel,—but the brave forgive.

Great in the battle's strife, the dungeon's gloom,  
What arm of terror forced thee to the tomb ?  
While, awed to silence by the wond'rous tale,  
E'en at thy name Arabia's son grew pale,<sup>1</sup>  
Or, if his fiery steed, with startled tread,  
Shrank from the thicket's pathless side in dread,  
He fear'd, lest, seen amid the twilight shade,  
Thy form had cross'd him in the tangled glade,<sup>2</sup>—  
What giant warrior dared to stem thy course,  
Unscared by treach'ry, and untamed by force ?  
One humble arm, one silent shaft could bring  
Fate's awful summons on its noiseless wing.  
Yet, tho' the clarion spoke not, tho' the sound  
Of festal triumph scarce was heard around,  
Tho', from her brow the with'ring chaplet torn,  
Sad Vict'ry stoop'd her haughty head to mourn,—  
In that dark hour a purer bliss was given,  
And peaceful seraphs hymn'd their joy in heaven,  
When on thy lips their own compassion hung,<sup>3</sup>  
And mercy trembled on thy falt'ring tongue,  
When, quell'd each earthly foe, thy virtue broke  
Vindictive feeling's sway, and passion's yoke,  
In thy last breath forgiveness' voice was heard,  
And life's best conquest crown'd thy latest word.

JOSEPH ANSTICE,

• CHRIST CHURCH.

<sup>1</sup> See Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, vol. xi. p. 146.

<sup>2</sup> “La valeur de Richard fut si renommée, que long-temps après la mort de ce prince, quand'un cheval tressailloit sans cause, les Sarrazins disoient, qu'il avoit vu l'ombre de Richard.”—Chateaubriand, *Itinér.* tome ii. p. 271.

<sup>3</sup> “Tunc præcepit eum (Bertramnum de Gardun) rex solvi, et dixit, Remitte tibi mortem meam.”—R. de Hoveden. p. 449.

## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

*The Delphin and Variorum Classics*, Nos. 113 to 116, containing *Livy*. Pr. 1l. 1s. per No.—Large paper, double. Present Subscription, 983.

As it may not be convenient to new Subscribers to purchase at once all the Nos. now published, Mr. Valpy will accommodate such by delivering one or two back Nos. with each new No. till the set is completed. Very few copies are left for disposal.

*Inscriptionum Latinarum Selectarum amplissima Collectio*, ad illustrandam *Romanæ Antiquitatis* Disciplinam accommodata, ac magnarum Collectionum Supplementa complura, Emendationesque exhibens. Cum ineditis Io. CASP. HAGENBUCHII suisque Adnotationibus edidit Io. CASP. ORELLIUS. Insunt lapides Helvetiæ omnes. Accedunt præter Fogginiæ Calendaria Antiqua, Hagenbuchii, Maffei, Ernestii, Reiskii, Seguierii, Steinbruechelii Epistolæ aliquot epigraphicæ nunc primum editæ.

*A Critical Investigation of the Versification and Prosodial Usages of the Iliad and Odyssey*; with a view to the general restoration of the Homeric readings; embracing some original theories relative to the primitive orthography of the Poems. By HENRY W. WILLIAMS, Author of "A Critical Inquiry into the Principles and Laws of the Grecian Tragic Poetry," in *Class. Journ.* No. LXXIII. &c. 8vo. Price 4s. 6d.

*The Idyllia* and other Poems that are extant of *Bion* and *Moschus*: translated from the Greek into English Verse. To which are added, a few other Translations, with Notes Critical and Explanatory. Price 6s. 6d.

We shall hope to give a notice of this work in our next.

*The Chronological Guide*; part I. comprehending the Chronology of the World, from its creation to the destruction of the Western empire of Rome, A. D. 476. Accompanied with a Chart, and a Series of Historical and Chronological Questions. To which is added an Appendix, containing explanations of Terms employed in History, and of the principal Grecian, Roman, and Jewish Measures and Coins.

*The most easy Greek Exercises*, for the use of the lower forms; with a Greek and English Lexicon of every word: or an introduction to Huntingford's, Neilson's, Dalzell's, Sandford's, Valpy's, &c. Exercises. By the Rev. WM. MOSLEY, A.M. LL.D.

*Novi Testamenti Biblia Triglotta: sive Græci Textus*

Archetypi, Versionis Syriacæ, et Versionis Latinae Vulgatæ, Synopsis: cui accedunt Subsidia Critica Varia. folio. Cadell, London.

Frid. Creuzer, the celebrated Professor of Græek at Heidelberg, in a Letter to Mr. Thos. Taylor the Platonist, dated the 20th of March, 1828, says; "De Plotino quod quæris, moveo quotidie, et adhuc eo usque promovi, ut anno 1829 meunte, si Deus annuerit, omnes Enneadas una cum Porphyrio de Vita Plotini et Indicibus Typographeo tradere possim describendas, ita ut simul lucem prodire queant Plotiniana omnia."

#### IN THE PRESS.

*The Medea of Euripides*, on the plan of the *Hecuba*, by the Rev. J. R. MAJOR. Duod. Price 5s. Will be published in August.

*An Abridgment and Translation of VIGER, BOS, HOOGEVEEN, and HERMAN*, for the use of Schools. By the Rev. J. SEAGER, Author of "*Critical Observations on Classical Authors*," and several Greek criticisms in the *Classical Journal*.—The four Works will form about 220 pages each, and may be purchased separately, or together in one vol. 8vo. VIGER will be published in July. Price 7s. •

*Proposals for Publishing by Subscription, A History of Initiation*, comprising a detailed Account of the Rites and Ceremonies, Doctrines and Discipline, of all the Secret and Mysterious Institutions of the Ancient World. By the Rev. G. OLIVER, Vicar of Clee. In Demy Octavo. Price to Subscribers, 7s. 6d. Non-Subscribers. 10s. 6d.

---

#### FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

---

*Contents of the 'Journal des Savans' for January, 1828.*

1. Sur les Grottes Sépulcrales Etrusques, recently discovered near Corneto, the ancient Tarquinium. [Article by M. Raoul-Rochette.]

2. Procli philosophi Platonici Opera, à codd. Mss. Bibliogh. Parisiensis nunc primum edidit, lectionis varietate et commentariis illustravit Victor Cousin. [Article by M. Daunou.]

3. Lettres écrites du Levant. Letters from the East, by John Carne, Esq. of Queen's Coll. Camb. [Article by the Baron Silvestre de Sary.]

4. Dictionnaire Français-Wolof et Français-Bambara, suivi du Dictionnaire Wolof-Français, by M. Dard.—Grammaire Wolofe, or a plan for studying the language of the negroes who inhabit the kingdoms of Bourba-yolof, of Walo, of Daniel, &c.; to which is added an Appendix, wherein are established the most essential peculiarities of the various languages of North Africa, by the same Author. [Article by Abel-Rémusat.]

5. Mission à Syam et à Hué, capital of Cochin China, in 1821 and 1822, according to the Journal of the late G. Finlayson; with an account of the Author, by Sir T. Stamford Raffles. [Article by M. Eugène Burnouf.]

6. Literary Intelligence.

February.—1. Lettre à M. Abel-Rémusat, on the nature of Grammatical Forms in general, and on the genius of the Chinese Language in particular, by G. de Humboldt. [Article by the Baron Silvestre de Sacy.]

2. Sur les Grottes Sepulcrales Etrusques, recently discovered near Corneto, the ancient Tarquinium. [2nd Article by M. Raoul-Rochette.]

3. Monographie des Orobranches, by J. P. Vaucher, of Geneva, with 16 plates. [Article by M. Tessier.]

4. Raoul ou Rodolphe, who became King of France in the year 923, an Historical Dissertation, by Guillon de Montléon. [Article by M. Daunou.]

5. Papyri Græci regni Taurinensis Musæi Ægyptii editi atque illustrati ab Amadeo Peyron; pars prima. [2nd Article by M. Letronne.]

6. Répertoire des Mines, ou Recueil de Lettres-patentes, Mémoires et Notices, on the Mineral Substances in the States of his Majesty the King of Sardinia, vols. 1 and 2. [Article by M. Chevreuil.]

7. Literary Intelligence.

March.—1. Le Roman de Rou et des Ducs de Normandie, by Robert Wace; with notes in explanation of the text, by M. Frederic Pluquet. [Article by M. Raynouard.]

2. Lettre à M. Abel-Rémusat sur la nature des Formes Grammaticales en général, and on the genius of the Chinese Language in particular. [2nd Article by the Baron de Sacy.]

3. Histoire de Normandie, par Orderic Vital, translated into French by M. Louis Dubois.

4. Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland. [Article by Abel-Rémusat.]

5. Homer nach Antiken gezeichnet, von H. W. Tischbein.—Galleria Omerica, o Raccolta di Monumenti Antichi esibita dal C. Fr. Inghirami, per servire allo studio dell' Iliade, e dell' Odissea. [Article by M. Raoul-Rochette.]

6. Sur quelques Inscriptions inédites trouvées dans la Cyrénaique, par M. Pacho. [Article by M. Letronne.]

7. Literary Intelligence.



*La Société Asiatique de Paris* has finished the first series of its journal, a series composed of 66 numbers, being from July 1822 till December 1827 : 100 francs, at Dondey-Dupré's, Paris. The second series commenced with the month of January last, by the title of *Nouveau Journal Asiatique*, consisting of 96 pages instead of 62, which augmentation will be continued : the price of the annual subscription is now 25 francs.

*The Society of Geography at Paris*, offers a golden medal of the value of 1000 francs to the traveller who shall have made in the year 1828 the most important geographical discovery.

### NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*Examen du texte de Clément d'Alexandrie*, respecting the various modes of writing among the Egyptians, by M. Letronne. Paris, 1827, at the Royal printing press. 8vo.

*Explication d'un tableau peint sur peau de rélin*; representing the writing of almost all people, ancient and modern, their hieroglyphic and ideographic systems, &c.; by M. de Brière, member of the Société Asiatique de Paris. Dondey-Dupré. in 8vo. This representation is exposed at the entrance of the Hall called *Des Globes*, at the King's library at Paris. The explanation may be had of the porter at the same library, price 1 franc.

*Biographie Universelle, ancienne et moderne*. Vol. 50, being the last but one of this celebrated work. Paris, 1827, printed by Everat.

Ἀρρίανου τῶν Ἐπικτήτου Διατριβῶν βιβλία τέσσαρα. The four books of Arrian, entitled *Dissertations of Epictetus*, revised and corrected by M. Coray. Paris, F. Didot, 1827. 2 vols. 8vo.

*Description des Monumens Musulmans*, forming the cabinet of the Duke de Blacas; or a collection of engraved stones, Arabian, Persian, and Turkish; medals, vases, cups, &c.; by M. Reinaud. 2 vols. 8vo. Embellished with six plates, and printed by authority at the Royal printing press, Paris. Subscriptions are taken, without an advance, at the Oriental Library of Dondey-Dupré, price 18 francs.

*Il Paradiso Perduto*; *Paradise Lost*, by Milton; translated into Italian, by Lazzaro Pappi. Milan, 1827. 3 vols. 16mo.

*Dinarchi Orationes tres*, Græcè et Latine, cum notis Reiskii, Ruhnkenii, &c. et editoris, C. A. Schmidt; accedunt indices. Lipsiæ, 1826, 8vo.

*Alcæi Mitylenæi Reliquiæ*, cum notis Aug. Matthiæ. Lipsiæ, 1827, 8vo.

*Æli Aristides Declamationes, Læptineæ*, emendatas atque annotationibus cum suis, tum Angeli Maii et Jacobi Morelli illustratas, edidit J. H. Gravert. Bonnæ, Habicht, 1827. Price 1 rix-dollar 8 gr.

*Quæstiones Herodotæ*, auctore Cat. Lud. Heyse. Pars prima, Berolini, 1827, 8vo. This first part treats of the life and travels of Herodotus.

A theological collection is announced under the title of *Corpus Reformatorum, seu opera quæ supersunt omnia scriptorum sæculi XVI. qui de sacrarum Christianorum emendatione optimè meriti, pro patribus et auctoribus Ecclesiæ Evangelicæ habendi sunt*; M. Lutheri, Phil. Melancthonis, Hudalr. Zwinglii, J. Calvini, aliorumque qui in hoc genere secundi ordinis putandi sunt, et ante annum 1555 floruerunt, ut Hutteni, Æcolampadii, &c. The number of vols. is not yet determined; but the subscription is opened at Halle, at Schwetschke's. at 1 rix-dollar per vol.

*Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi, et autres bibliothèques*, published by the Institut Royal of France (Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres), vol. xi. Paris, Royal printing-press, 1827, in 4to. The 1st part of this vol. is dedicated to Oriental literature, and contains four articles; the 2nd part to Greek and Latin literature, and consists of five articles.

*Mémoires sur quelques Inscriptions Puniques*, by M. Stephan Quatremère, Paris, at the Royal press, 1828. Extracted from the New Journal Asiatique.

#### Oriental Works.

*L'Alphabet Européen appliqué aux Langues Asiatiques*; simplification des Langues Orientales; l'Hébreu simplifié par la méthode alphabétique; by Volney, 1 vol. 8vo.—This work forms the 8th vol. of the 2nd edition of the complete works of Volney.

Nouvelle méthode pour étudier l'Hébreu des Saintes Ecritures; to which is added, the History of Ruth, by the Abbé Beuzelin, 1 vol. 12mo.

*Voyage dans la Russie Méridionale*; Journey into South Russia, more particularly into the provinces beyond Caucasus, performed from 1820 to 1824, by M. Gamba, French Consul at Tiflis, 2 vols. 8vo.

Four maps accompany this work; among which is seen a general map of the countries between the Caspian and the Black Seas, with a description of the new frontiers of Russia and Persia as agreed on in 1819. This map bears the name of J. M. Darmet; but it is merely the reproduction of a map by the Russian general, Khatov: an atlas in small folio is attached to this work, consisting of 60.

colored plates, representative of the costumes of Persia, of Georgia, &c.

*Le Coran*, translated into French by Savary, preceded by a Notice on Mahomet.

*Chrestomathie Arabe*, by the Baron Silvestre de Sacy. 2nd edition, corrected and enlarged. 3 vols. 8vo; printed at the Royal press, Paris.

*Prospectus et specimen d'un Dictionnaire Français-Arabe*, by M. Elious Boethor; revised and enlarged by M. A. Caussin de Percival. Professor of vulgar Arabic.

*Description de l'Egypte*, original edition; last delivery, or the third section of the third delivery; in folio, at the Royal press. This delivery corresponds with the deliveries 177—191 of the 8vo. edition by M. Panckoucke.

*Mémoire sur les Pyramides d'Egypte*, and on the religious system of their erection and destination, by G. Lepère Poitiers. 1 vol. 4to.

*Histoire Philosophique et Politique des Etablissemens et du Commerce des Européens dans l'Afrique Septentrionale*. Philosophical and Political History of the Establishments and Commerce of Europeans in North Africa; a posthumous work of G. T. Raynal, 2 vols. in 8vo. with a map.

*Contes extraits de Thouthi-nameh*; translated from the Persian, by M. G. S. Trebutien, of Caen: 50 copies only of this work have been printed.

*La Chine*. Manners, Customs, Arts and Trades, &c. of China, by MM. Devéria, Régnier, Schaal, Schmit, Vidal, &c. with explanatory notes and an introduction, by M. de Malpière, large 4to. —Fourteen numbers of this work have been published, which will consist of 3 vols. An analysis of this work has been given, by M. Abel-Rémusat, in the *Journal des Savans*, 1827, p. 690.

*Histoire des Croisades*, by Michaud, 4th edition, 8 vols. in 8vo. with maps, 64 francs. Paris.

*Just published, Inedited Tales of the 1001 Nights*; extracted from the original Arabic, after an Arabic Ms. written at Cairo in the 1217th year of the Hejra, by Sheikh Ali Elamsari; translated into German by M. J. de Hammer, interpreter of Oriental languages to the Emperor of Austria, &c. &c., and now first translated into French by M. G. S. Trebutien, of Caen, member of the Asiatic Society of Paris. 3 vols. on fine paper, and with a new type. Price 21 francs.

*Essai sur l'Ecriture Sainte.* An Essay on Holy Writ, or an Historical Exposition of the Advantages to be derived from Oriental Languages in the study and intelligence of the Sacred Writings; embellished with a plate, on which are engraved the characters of those languages, by the Abbé Du Contant de la Mollette. Paris, 1775; 12mo. half-bound, 5 francs.

*Le Pentateuque en Hébreu ponctué:* with the translation opposite to it by Onkelos; and the commentaries of Salomon Sarchi de Lunel; to which is added, the *Haphtaroth* of the whole year. Lunerille, 5569 (1809). 5 vols. 8vo. good paper, 28 francs.

*Les 12 petits Prophètes.* The 12 lesser Prophets, in Hebrew, with the Chaldaic Paraphrase of Jonathan ben Uziel, with the Commentaries of Salomon Jarchi, of Ebn Ezra, and of David Kimchi. Paris, Robert Etienne, 1555, in 4to. 24 francs.

*Evangeliaire, en Arabe;* or Collection of Gospels, in Arabic, for the Sundays and Holy days throughout the year, printed in 1776, at the Monastery of Marakanna: small folio, binding of the country, 42 francs.

*Bibliothèque Orientale of D'Herbelot,* containing every thing relating to the people of the East, their writings, &c. Maestricht, 1776; with Visdelou's supplement, *ibid.* 1780. 2 vols. in folio, 60 francs.—A copy entirely new, with all its margins.

*Antiquités de la Nubie,* by M. Gau; 12th delivery, in folio of two leaves, besides four plates. This superior work is completed: the 13th delivery, or number, is just published.

*Rosenmüller, Scholia in Vetus Testamentum.* Part vi. vol. ii. contains Ezechiel, vol. ii. edit. 2 —Part vii. vol. i. Hoseas et Joel. —Vol. ii. Amos, Obadiah, and Jonas, ed. ii.—Part viii. vol. ii. Jeremiah. 8vo.

*קהלת דוד Collectio Davidis, id est Catalogus R. Davidis Oppenheimeri* (Hambourg). 1 vol. 8vo.

This rich collection of Hebrew, collected by the Rabbi Oppenheimer, contains 4100 works; the last date of which is 1733: the *תולדות ישוע tolédoth ieschoria* is not among them, so that it has probably been withdrawn.

*Sanctioniathonis Berytii quæ feruntur fragmenta de Cosmogonia et Theologia Phœnicum,* Græcè versa à Philone Byblio, servata ab Eusebio Cæsariensi, Græcè et Latine recognovit, emendavit, notis selectis Scaligeri, Bocharti, &c. suisque animadversionibus illustravit J. C. Orellius. 1 vol. in 8vo.

*اشعار الحماسة Hamasæ carmina cum Tebrizii scholiis integris,* indicibus perfectis, versione Latina, et commentario perpetuo, pri-

num edidit G. W. Freytag. The two first numbers or deliveries of the Arabian text (Bonn) in 4to.

Respecting this edition, vide the Report of the Baron de Sacy in the *Journal Asiatique*, vol. 10, p. 189, and the prospectus of the editor in the same *Journal*, vol. 8, p. 52.

*The 1001 Nights in Arabic, after a Ms. of Tunis*, given by M. Habicht, is printing at Breslau, in Arabic, in 12mo. The 1st vol. was published in 1825; the 2nd is now published. The title of this celebrated work, according to this manuscript, is,

هذا كتاب الف ليلة و ليلة ص البتة الى المنتها

Q. d. This is the book of the 1000 nights and a night, from the beginning to the end. It is well known that the oriental term 1001 is allegorical of many, and similar to our expression of hundreds, thousands, &c.

*Catalogus librorum tam manuscriptorum quam impressorum qui jussu Divi Augusti Ducis Saxo-Gothani a Beato Sectzenio in Oriente emti, in bibliotheca Gothana asservantur.* J. H. Moellero, tom. i. part 2.—*Accedit de numis orientalibus in numophylacio Gothano asservatis commentatio prima* (Gotha, in 4to).

*Veterum Hebræorum notiones de rebus post mortem futuris ex fontibus collatæ:* Dissert. Inaug. de J. C. G. Johansen. Pars I, librum *ברשור* complectens (Copenhagen, 1 vol. 8vo.

*Philonis Judæi Paralipomena Armenica:* libri videlicet quatuor in Genesim, libri duo in Exodum, sermo unus de Sampson, alter de Jona, tertius de tribus angelis Abrahamo apparentibus: opera hactenus inedita, ex Armenica versione antiquissima, &c. nunc primum in Latinum translata per J. B. Aucler, (Venise,) 1 vol. 4to.

Jacobi (Sancti) Apostoli Epistolæ Catholicæ *versio Arabica et Æthiopica* Latinitate utraque donata, notis philologicis et probatissimorum Arabum scriptis illustrata, etc. Opera J. G. Nisselii et Petræi Leyden. Elzevir. 1654, in 4to. vellum, 20 francs.

*Rituel des Prières journalières à l'usage des Israélites*, translated from the Hebrew by J. Auspach: a new edition, revised and corrected (Metz), 1 vol. in 8vo. The Hebrew text is placed opposite to the French translation.

Rosepmüller *Scholia in Vetus Testamentum*, part vii. vol. iii. (*Prophetæ Minores*, vol. 3.) continens *Micha, Nahum et Habacuc*; edit. 2. aucta et emend.

*Harethi Moallaca cum Scholiis Zuzenii* e codicibus Parisiensibus, et Abulolæ carmina duo inedita e codice Petropolitano, edidit,

Latine vertit, et commentario instruxit J. Villers. Bonn, 1 vol. in 4to. —The Baron S. de Sacy has given an account of this work in the *Journal des Savans* of 1827, p. 337—348.

*Abu Muhammedis Elkasimi*,<sup>1</sup> (vulgo dicti Harrisii Borrensis narrationes (concessus enarrationes) XLIII, hactenus ineditæ, in usum Collegii domestici, e quatuor Codicibus Mss. descripsit et notulis sive scholiis marginalibus instruxit *Scheidius*, 1755, in 4to. Cart. (Ms.) 15 francs. Dondey-Dupré. Paris.

*Abi l'Walidi Ebn Zeiduni Risalet*, seu epistolum Arabicæ et Latine, cum notulis edidit *Reiske*. Leips. 1755, in 4to. (*scarce*) 10 fr. 50 c. Dondey-Dupré.

*Canticle and Congratulation to his Most Christian Majesty Louis 18th, King of France*, composed in Arabic by Michael Sabbagh (an Israelite of Morocco), and translated into French by Grangeret de la Grange; 4to. 3 francs.

*Tydeman Conspectus Operis (Arabici)*<sup>2</sup> *Ibn Chalicani* de Vitis illustrium Virorum. Leyd. 1809, 4to. 15 francs.

*Choue ven kiai tsen thoung che*. The Dictionary called *Chou-ven*, with the commentary of Siu Khiai; 7 vols. in 8vo. fine impression, on white paper.

The *Choue-ven* is a most ancient Chinese Lexicon, its author Hiu Tchin finished it in the 121st year of Christ. It is arranged according to 540 keys, and is in the character of the ancient writing called *Siao Tchouen*. The decisions of the *Chou ven* are of high authority with the Chinese lexicographers, and this work forms the basis of all posterior dictionaries. It was revised and corrected in 986 A. C. This edition was made by Khian Loung, and was published in 1782.

*Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*, consilio et cura Jacobi Facciolati, opera et studio Egidii Forcellini, seminarii Patavini alumni, lucubratum; in hac tertia editione auctum et emendatum a Josepho Furlanetto, alumno ejusdem seminarii, Vol. 1. No. 1. *A—animatus*.

This third edition, which will contain nearly 5,000 words quite new and marked with an asterisk, and at least 10,000 corrections, will be divided into four large vols. in 4to, of about 400 pages each. A number, containing 25 pages, will be published every two months: the price on ordinary paper for every hundred pages will be 20 francs. Subscriptions are received at Padua at the printing-press of the seminary; and at Milan, at Stella's.

<sup>1</sup> That is to say, *Abu-Muhammed el Kassem*.

<sup>2</sup> That is to say, *Ebn Khalikan*.

*Marci Tullii Ciceronis Opera*, uno volumine comprehensa. Ex recensione J. A. Ernestii studiosè recognita & edit C. F. A. Nobb. Editio stereotypa, large 4to. of 1218 pp. Price 7 tahlr. 12 gr. Leipzig, 1827; Tauchnitz. Paris, Ponthieu. This edition, besides being correctly executed, is preceded by Arnals Ciceroniani ex Corrado, Fabricio, aliisque concinnati, which are of great use in respect to the historical interpretation of the Latin classics.

*Abu l'Abbasi Amedis, Tulonidarum primi, vita et res gestæ.* Ex codicibus Mss. Bibliothecæ Lugduno-Batavæ editisque libris concinnavit et auctorum testimonia adjecit Taco Roorda, Theol. et Lit. Hum. Doctor. In 4to: Leyden, 1825; Luchtmanns.

*Platonis de Ideis et Numeris Doctrina ex Aristotele illustrata*, by Dr. F. A. Trendelenburg, royal 8vo. price 15 gr. Leipzig, 1825. Vogel.

*De l'Usage de l'Impératif chez les Latins.* On the use of the Imperative with the Latins, by Nicholas Krarup. The object of this dissertation is to determine in what sense the different tenses of the imperative mood were employed: the present serves to express the order that was to be executed instantly; the future, when a short period was to pass between the order and its execution, as in the 15th verse of the 5th Eclogue,

*Experiar: tu deinde iubeto certet Amyntas.*

M. Krarup adds that the Latins often employ the present of the subjunctive instead of the present and the future of the imperative. Example: *Audi, Jupiter, audite, fines, audiat, fas.* (lib. i. 32.) And even the perfect of the subjunctive, as is proved in this phrase of Cicero: *Secreto hoc audi, tecum habeto, ne Apellæ quidem liberto tuo dixeris.* (Cic. ad Fam. vii. 25.)

*Poetæ Latini veteres* ad fidem optimarum editionum expressi, et in unum volumen reducti. In 8vo. Florentiæ; 1828.

This collection, forming but 1 vol., will contain 1440 pages, comprising Catullus, Lucretius, Virgilus, Tibullus, Propertius, Horatius, Ovidius, Manilius, Phædrus, Lucanus, Persius, Silius Italicus, Statius, Valerius Flaccus, Juvenalis, Martialis, Claudianus, Plautus, Terentius, Seneca. The edition will be published in 6 numbers, each containing 15 folios, at the price of 50 paoli, or 28, 1/2 e.

*Observations sur les Langues Phénicienne et Punique, et sur leurs Rapports avec l'Hébreu.* Observations on the Phœnician and Punic languages, and of their affinity with the Hebrew.

From the light which has been lately thrown on the Phœnic-Punic language, it appears that it bears considerable resemblance to the Hebrew—on which subject the following results have been obtained: 1st. The Phœnician words which have been decyphered for the most part perfectly coincide with those of the ancient

Hebrew, even in their forms, which are quite peculiar to this last idiom. 2ndly. The differences are very rare, and may even be considered as purely local; they are reduced to the addition of one letter either at the commencement or the end, and to the frequent use of the vowels U and I in the Punic language. 3dly. The words which are not to be found in the Hebrew language are not to be found in the other dialects of the Semetic languages.

*Golii Lexicon Arabico-Latinum.* Lugduni Batavor. 1653. in folio, price 280 francs, at Ponthieu and Co., Palais Royal, Paris. The first leaf of the preface and one of the dictionary are manuscript, and on the margins of many pages are notes and hieroglyphics in pencil.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

SIR,

I BEG leave to call the attention of the learned world to a work, written by Sir Uvedale Price, on the pronunciation of Greek and Latin verse. The system which it adopts, may be new to many, though it is not new to me. Thirty years ago a little treatise, intitled "Metronariston," was put into my hands, by the gentleman to whom I construed my lessons. The object of this treatise is to show, that we completely spoil the beauty and harmony of versification by our common mode of reading, and that we ought to read according to *quantity*. I believe that nature had given me a correct ear; and I suppose it was owing to this circumstance, that I immediately perceived the great superiority of the new method, or rather the old method revived. I read my Homer with increased delight; and when I commenced the study of the Greek Tragedies, I found that the effect of Iambic, as well as Hexameter verses, was wonderfully improved by this system of recitation. Nothing surely can be more barbarous, preposterous, and inconsistent, than the manner in which we immolate Greek and Latin prosody, on the altar of established custom. We are careful to pronounce correctly the penultima of a word. We are shocked if a false quantity be there made; we are shocked as much as at the shooting of a robin; but as other birds are lawful game, so it is allowable to murder the other syllables at pleasure. We make dactyls of anapæsts, trochees of iambs, &c. If we hear an Irishman, or a Scotchman, or a modern Greek pro-



nounce a line of Homer, or of Sophocles, according to the accents; our ears are much annoyed. Yet we do what is much worse. We pronounce neither according to ancient accent, nor ancient quantity; but according to the nature and idiom of our own language. We lay the stress upon this, or that syllable, according to the number of syllables in the word.

The work of Sir Uvedale Price above mentioned comprises the sum and substance of the *Metronariston*; but the doctrine is set forth at greater length, is supported by numerous arguments, illustrations, and examples. The style of his composition is pure and classical; and the work is enlivened by many agreeable strokes of humor. His illustrations are sometimes very felicitous. As I live in a retired village, and never read any of the periodical publications, I know not whether this interesting work has excited any public notice, or raised any discussion. If it have not, I shall feel happy, should I be in any measure the cause of its being more generally known.

If any person, either in the *Classical Journal*, or in any other publication, should oppose the system which I have cherished for thirty years, and which I now thus warmly recommend; I shall not consider it necessary to reply. I think this is a question, which does not depend on great talents, or profound learning; but on qualities of another kind. If the reader have a fine ear for music, and if he be a man of taste, he will immediately perceive, or rather immediately feel the infinite superiority of the method which has now been so clearly expounded, and so irrefragably established by the learned Baronet. If nature have not given him an ear for harmony, and if the muses have never erected their throne in his heart, it will be in vain for me to say any thing additional. Yet as a system, however excellent, may be attended by some disadvantages, I think it desirable to notice an objection which has been stated to me, and another which has presented itself to my mind. A young person, to whom I was lately recommending pronunciation by quantity, said, that this would be to read verses, as a school-boy does when he is scanning them.

This objection may be urged by others; but it must originate, either in great incorrectness of ear, or great inattention; perhaps in both. In Latin and Greek verses, the feet generally end either in the middle, or near the beginning, or near the end of a word. The school-boy therefore, when he is scanning, generally makes the pause in one of those three places. But when I recite a Greek or Latin verse according to quantity, I pause at the end of each word, *metre* as I should do, were I

to pronounce it in the ordinary way. So much for that objection. But there is another, which has occurred to me. It may be said, "you are confounding quantity and accent. When you imagine that you are reading by quantity, you are doing nothing more than placing the accent on one syllable instead of another." I reply, that this is not wholly true. It is certainly in our power to dwell longer on one syllable than another, though perhaps we may be unable to dwell twice as long on one as on another. But even if it were wholly true; what then? The stress must be laid somewhere; and that person who possesses correctness of ear, and elegance of mind, must at once perceive the incomparable advantages of the method which Sir U. Price so powerfully enforces, and which I so strenuously recommend. Let me here add, that if school-boys were obliged to read in this manner, their knowledge of prosody would be much increased. They would be obliged to pay more attention to it; for in many cases the master would perceive, at once, whether or not they knew the quantity of the syllables.

As the earnestness of my recommendation might be ascribed by some to the partiality of friendship, I think it right to state that I have no acquaintance whatever with Sir U. Price. This work was sent to me by Miss Barrett, a highly-favored child of the Muses; whose beautiful poem, entitled *An Essay on Mind*, written at the age of eighteen, would be generally admired, if generally known. She was anxious to learn my opinion of the book; and I was gratified, of course, on finding that it espoused a system, which had yielded me so much delight for so long a period. In case of its ever being generally taught, and permanently established; I should wish it to be here recorded, that in the early part of the nineteenth century there lived at least three persons, who were its firm supporters and strenuous partizans.

H. S. BOYD.

P. S. In one part of his work Sir U. Price justly reprobates the absurd custom of retaining in Latin verse the vowels which are elided, though we carefully reject them when reciting Greek verse. For many years it has been my custom to cut off the supernumerary vowels, when reciting Latin, as well as when reciting Greek poetry.

*The School Prize Poems* sent us are worthy the *Universities*; but we are obliged to decline the insertion of any but such as emanate from the latter.

*Athenæum.*

SIR,

Accidentally looking into the *Classical Journal*, I noticed, in your account of the Mss. of Mr. Drury, that you had copied the error of the compiler of the Sale-Catalogue in your description of the *Chronicle* page 169.

As it may mislead the future historian and biographer in their searches to know who this "Episcopus Thomas" was, I trust you will give this short explanation. The word in the Manuscript is Epithome, or, in modern orthography, Epitome, and signifies nothing more than that the book is an Epitome of *Chronicles*.

I am, &amp;c.

T. P.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

London, June 2, 1828. 2, Queen's Square Place.

THE dreadful conflagration by which the town of Åbo was lately totally destroyed, and its inhabitants reduced to inconceivable distress, has been already made known to the British public, who, with their wonted benevolence, have subscribed between 800 and 900*l.* for the relief of these distant and destitute sufferers. This amount has been judiciously distributed, and most thankfully received.

When I visited Finland a few years ago, the University of Åbo was in a most prosperous and improving condition. It had many distinguished Professors, and was the seat and the source of civilization of the whole country. A literary journal was established there, and almost all the works published in Finland issued from the press of Åbo. Attached to the University were a valuable Museum of natural history, extensive philosophical apparatus, and a library consisting of more than thirty thousand volumes, rich in records and unpublished manuscripts relating to the history of Finland and Sweden. With the exception of about eight hundred volumes, of which not more than two hundred form perfect works, the whole of this interesting collection perished in the flames; and the circumstances were so much the more distressing, as the library funds had been wholly exhausted, and even anticipated for years in order to gain possession of works which were then obtainable, and which were deemed of great importance to the establishment. In a country like Finland, so little visited, so far removed from the attention and sympathy of the civilized world, the destruction of the only large public library is a calamity, the greatness and extent of which can hardly be estimated here.

I have been addressed by some valuable Finnish friends on the subject, and have been requested to ascertain whether many of the literary and scientific individuals of our country would not probably contribute their own writings or those of others, to repair the dreadful loss with which Finland has been visited. And I have ventured to say, that I feel persuaded numbers would be found cheerfully to assist in the re-

formation of their library. The inhabitants of Finland are almost universally poor, but as universally desirous of instruction; and of late many men have appeared among them, who have done no inconsiderable services to science, philosophy, and the belles-lettres. So much have even the Finnish peasants been touched by the destruction of the Åbo library, that in some places where money is little known, they have subscribed the produce of their farms towards its restoration; and among them the villagers of Wichtis sent fifty barrels of rye; the University of Dorpat has contributed 394 scientific works, besides many philosophical instruments and collections in natural history. One liberal Russian bookseller (Mr. Hartmann of Riga) has presented books to the value of 5357 silver rubles, or nearly 800*l.* sterling. His townsman, Mr. German, sent 193 volumes. Dr. Hassar of Petersburg, 995; and Professor Storch (whose works on political economy are so well known), 269. Many other useful and generous donations have been received; and I confidently trust that examples so honorable will find many imitators here. Messrs. George Cowie and Co., of No. 31 Poultry, have kindly undertaken to receive and forward any works, instruments, &c. which may be liberally given to the Åbo University Library. I shall be most happy to communicate any particulars I possess; and if information be desired from the spot, the venerable archbishop of Finland, Dr. Tengstrom, or M. John Julin, will, I am sure, be most happy to furnish it.

JOHN BOWRING.

\* \* Transactions of Learned and Scientific Societies will be particularly acceptable.

---

[ADVERTISEMENTS.]

Just published, 8vo. price 12s.

**HORATHI TURSELLINI ROMANI DE PARTICULIS LATINÆ ORATIONIS**

Libellus Utilissimus; post curas JACOBI THOMASII et JO. CONRADI SCHWARZII denuo recognitus et auctus; ex editione in Germania quinta Anglicaque Interpretatione (vice Germanicæ) instruendum curavit JACOBUS BAILEY.

Londini; Impensis Ricardi Priestley et Joannis R. Priestley.

\* \* Magna hujus libelli, a Thomasio quidem et Schwarzio locupletati, dos est. Particularum enim varius et multiplex usus est in quacunque lingua, quem, qui ignorat, malus esse solet interpres. Hinc vel cum primis curatione earum notitia in Latina lingua esse debet, quia dici non potest quantum lucis inde accedat instituendæ classicorum, quos vocant, auctorum metaphrasi et imitationis ad orationem convenientibus sibi vinctis, et tamquam artuum suorum ligaminibus adstringendam elegantiae ac venustati. Quare omnibus eruditis qui post renatas literas castitatem et ætatem in scribendo sectati sunt, ea omni tempore curæ cordique rest. NOTENII LEXICON ANTIBARBARUM.

This day is published, in 8vo. price 15s. boards.

**SOPHOCLES.**

**THE TRAGEDIES OF SOPHOCLES,**

Literally translated into English Prose, from the Greek Text of Brunck, with Notes, the *Second Edition*, very much improved, 2 vols. 8vo.

Oxford, D. A. Talboys; and Longman, Rees, Orme, Browne, and Green, London:

Where may be had,

**EURIPIDES.** The *Hecuba*, *Orestes*, *Phœnician Virgins*, and *Medea* of Euripides, literally translated into English Prose, from the Text of Porson, with Notes, the *Third Edition*, revised and corrected, 8vo. boards, 8s.

**THE HECUBA AND ALCESTIS OF EURIPIDES**, literally translated into English Prose, with Notes, 8vo. boards, 4s. 6d.

**ARISTOPHANES.** The Comedies of *Plutus* and the *Frogs*, literally translated into English Prose, with copious Notes, 8vo. 8s.

**THE RHETORIC OF ARISTOTLE**, literally translated from the Greek, with Notes; to which is added, an Analysis of Aristotle's Rhetoric, by THOMAS HOBBS of Malmsbury, with Notes. 8vo. boards, 12s.

A SYNOPSIS OF ALDRICH'S LOGIC, beautifully printed on a single sheet of royal paper, price only 1s. 6d.

**THE FOREIGN QUARTERLY REVIEW,**

No. IV. Price Seven Shillings and Sixpence.

CONTENTS.—ART. I. Life and Works of Wieland.—II. Cailliaud's Travels to Méroé, and the White River, &c.—III. Spanish Novelists.—IV. Niebuhr's Roman History.—V. Neapolitan Superstitions.—VI. Páixhans's New Maritime Force and Artillery.—VII. Lebrun's Voyage to the Nile.—VIII. Modern Spanish Comedy.—IX. Italian Literature of the Eighteenth Century.—X. Illyrian Poetry.—XI. Kleist's Dramatic Works.—XII. Retzsch's Illustrations of Hamlet.—XIII. to XXVI. Critical Sketches of Latin, Italian, French, German, and Spanish Works.—Miscellaneous Notices, No. IV.—List of the Principal Works published on the Continent, from January to April, 1828.

Published by Treuttel and Würtz, Treuttel Jun. and Richter, 30, Soho Square; of whom may be had Numbers I. II. and III.

No V. will appear in August.

END OF No. LXXIV.











